Preposition Stranding in German Dialects[*]

Jürg Fleischer

Universität Zürich

▪ ABSTRACT

In this paper, I will investigate the syntax of pronominal adverbs in German. One construction to be discussed is commonly called preposition stranding, this construction has been paid wide attention in the discussion on the structure of the PP. In section 1, I will argue that most studies dealing with preposition stranding in German are based on insufficient empirical evidence. In section 2, I will present the different constructions pronominal adverbs may be involved in, the data base being restricted to German dialects. It turns out that the pronominal adverbs exhibit a great variety of different constructions which should be accounted for. In section 3, I will draw some conclusions from the areal distribution of the various constructions and I will discuss some of the common assumptions concerning the constructions dealt with in the present paper. Finally, I will propose a theory which tries to relate the type of preposition stranding known from Germanic SOV-languages to the type known from Germanic SVO-languages. For that purpose, Dutch and Frisian data will also be taken into consideration. In section 4, I will briefly discuss the findings achieved so far with regard to the relation between dialectology and formal linguistic theories.

The phenomena subsumed under the term *preposition stranding* have been paid wide attention within the discussion on the structure of the PP, the most influential studies probably being Riemsdijk 1978 (focusing on Dutch), Hornstein and Weinberg 1981 (mainly on English) and Oppenrieder 1990 (on German). First of all, it should be kept in mind that the term *preposition stranding* covers two quite different constructions. In Germanic SVO-languages such as English, preposition stranding refers to a construction in which a full DP (very often, though not obligatorily, specified for [+wh]) is moved from its governing preposition, such as in example (1):

(1)   *Who* did you write *about*?   (Hornstein and Weinberg 1981:56)

Germanic SOV-languages, such as for example Dutch, do not seem to have a direct equivalent (but see section 3. 5). It is only the small group of the so-called *pronominal adverbs* which exhibit a somewhat similar behaviour. *Pronominal adverbs* are formed from R-pronouns[1] (such as *daar* or *waar*) and primary prepositions[2] (leading to

....
[1] The term *R-pronoun* has the following origin: "These pronouns are usually called R-pronouns (following Van Riemsdijk 1978), because they all have the r-sound in their phonological form (*eR*, *daaR*, *hieR*, *waaR* …)." (Zwarts 1997a:1092).

[2] Not all prepositions can form a pronominal adverb. For Dutch, Zwarts (1997a: 1093) distinguishes between what he calls *type A prepositions* (which can form a pronominal adverb, and hence also exhibit stranding phenomena) and *type B prepositions* (which cannot). Zwarts (1997b: 2-6) shows that these two groups of prepositions are set apart by a number of other criteria, among them the following: type A prepositions form a closed class, which only consists of native words, usually small, monomorphemic, and frequent, while type B prepositions are an open class, containing also borrowings, the words are usually longer, often derived from other parts of speech, and non-frequent (see Zwarts 1997b: 6). – Within the framework of *Grammaticalization Theory*, a noun-to-affix cline has been postulated which involves also adpositions as steps on the scale and which reads as follows (taken from Hopper and Traugott 1993:107):
(i)   relational noun > secondary adposition > primary adposition > agglutinative case affix > fusional case affix
Primary and secondary adpositions are described as follows: "Secondary adpositions are usually forms (words or short phrases) that define concrete rather than grammatical relationships. They are typically derived from relational nouns, e.g., *beside the sofa*, *ahead of the column*. Primary adpositions are thought of as the restricted set of adpositions, often monosyllabic, that indicate purely grammatical relationships, such as *of*, *by*, and *to*." (Hopper and Traugott 1993:107).
It seems thus that Zwarts' (1997a, 1997b) *type A* and *type B prepositions* can be classified as *primary* and *secondary prepositions*. I will use the term *primary preposition*, rather than *type A preposition*, since this term at least tries to denote a property of the group of prepositions to be described and is thus somewhat more meaningful.

combinations such as *daarmee,* literally 'there-with', or *waarmee,* literally 'where-with').
These pronominal adverbs can be split up in Dutch, as shown in example (2):

(2)   *Waar* heb je het *mee* gedaan?
        where have you it with done
        'what have you done it with?'

<div align="right">(Riemsdijk 1978:192)</div>

Similarly, German too has a paradigm of pronominal adverbs: they can be formed by
combining the R-pronouns *da(r)-, wo(r)-* and *hier-* with about twenty primary
prepositions. According to the Duden Grammatik (1998:373), the following
combinations are possible in Standard German:

TABLE 1 ▪ *Pronominal adverbs in standard German*

	da(r)-	wo(r)-	hier-
an	daran	woran	hieran
auf	darauf	worauf	hierauf
aus	daraus	woraus	hieraus
bei	dabei	wobei	hierbei
durch	dadurch	wodurch	hierdurch
für	dafür	wofür	hierfür
gegen	dagegen	wogegen	hiergegen
hinter	dahinter	wohinter	hierhinter
in	darin/darein	worin/worein	hierin/hierein
mit	damit	womit	hiermit
nach	danach	wonach	hiernach
neben	daneben	woneben	hierneben
ob	darob	–	–
über	darüber	worüber	hierüber
um	darum	worum	hierum
unter	darunter	worunter	hierunter
von	davon	wovon	hiervon
vor	davor	wovor	hiervor
wider	dawider	–	–
zu	dazu	wozu	hierzu
zwischen	dazwischen	wozwischen	hierzwischen

Example (3) suggests that German pronominal adverbs can also be split up:

(3)   *wo* träumst du denn immer *von*?
        where dream you then always of
        'what are you always dreaming of?'

<div align="right">(Oppenrieder 1990:160)</div>

Before I turn to a description of the occurrence of this construction in German, it has to be mentioned that from a theoretical point of view, one could voice some objections

to classifying example (3) as preposition stranding: since R-pronouns always occur to the left of their governor, should one not rather talk of *postposition stranding*?[3] It is for this reason that Abraham (1995:337) claims: "German does not have preposition stranding. What comes close to this phenomenon characteristic for English only occurs in the substandard and rather concerns postpositionlike elements".[4] Nevertheless, the construction became quite important in theoretical discussions: "An enormous attention has been paid to this phenomenon since van Riemsdijk's (1978) detailed study on analogous cases in Dutch; cf. e.g. Fanselow (1983; 1991), Koster (1987), Grewendorf (1989), Bayer (1990; 1994), Müller (1991), Oppenrieder (1991), and Trissler (1993, 1999)." (Müller 2000:141).[5]

There is, however, one main difference between the Dutch and the German cases: whereas the construction occurs in the standard language in Dutch, it does not in German. At least in written standard German, this construction is unidiomatic. It is therefore may be not surprising that in different studies dealing with the construction,

....
[3] I do not think that the term *postposition* (and hence *postposition stranding*) is a particularly fortunate terminological solution for the adpositional element in a pronominal adverb. It is true, of course, that the adposition follows rather than precedes the R-pronoun in *damit* (cf. (i)), but this is a regularity of pronominal adverb formation. The very same adpositional items involved in this process, when taking any complement other than an R-pronoun, always precede the complement (cf. (ii)):

(i)   *mit da   damit   'with it'
(ii)   mit dem Mann   *dem Mann mit   'with the man'

It would thus sometimes be necessary to talk of 'mit' as a preposition and sometimes as a postposition. This is particularly awkward because in German, there are some adpositions which can take the same complement to their left and to their right (cf. (iii)), and there are even some adpositions which can only take a complement to their left, thus 'real postpositions' (cf. (iv)):

(iii)   wegen des Wetters   des Wetters wegen   'because of the weather'
(iv)   *zuliebe dem Mann   dem Mann zuliebe   'for the man's sake'

If we talk of *mit* in (i) as of a postposition and of *mit* in (ii) as of a preposition, then the terms *preposition* and *postposition* refer to grammatical processes rather than to lexical properties, which is somewhat contra-intuitive. The term *postposition* should be restricted to items like *zuliebe* in (iv) where it is clear that the property of taking a complement only to the left is part of the lexical entry of this item. As one reviewer points out: calling the adposition after an R-pronoun a postposition "would be tantamount to saying that French is an SOV language when the objects in a clause are clitics".

[4] "Das Deutsche kennt kein Präpositionsstranden. Was in die Nähe dieser für das Englische charakteristischen Erscheinung führt, wird nur substandardlich sichtbar, betrifft eher Postpositionsartiges …" (Abraham 1995:337)

[5] "Diesem Phänomen ist seit der ausführlichen Behandlung analoger Fälle im Niederländischen durch van Riemsdijk (1978) enorme Aufmerksamkeit zuteil geworden; vgl. etwa Fanselow (1983; 1991),Koster (1987), Grewendorf (1989), Bayer (1990; 1994), Müller (1991), Oppenrieder (1991) und Trissler (1993, 1999)." (Müller 2000:141)

we find strikingly different statements on its occurrence. According to Grewendorf, it occurs in "certain regional varieties of German" (1988:184); Breindl claims that it occurs "in Northern German varieties", but that it also belongs to the "passive language competence of speakers of Southern German" (1989:149). According to Oppenrieder, the construction can be found in "certain varieties of Standard German" (1990:159), but on the other hand he also speaks of "stranding dialects" (1990:162). Trissler claims that it occurs "in German" (1993:249), but whenever talking about one particular subtype of the construction, she refers to "some speakers" (1993:250, 269, 270, 271). For Abraham, as already quoted above, it occurs "in the substandard" (1995:337), for Gallmann, it belongs to "Low German and High German with Low German substratum" (1997:39), and for Müller, finally, it occurs "in Northern German varieties" (2000:141).

Apart from the consensus that the construction is associated with the north of the German speaking area, only one conclusion can be drawn from this quite heterogeneous picture: it is not clear (or at least not unitary), which variety these analyses are based on. And by *variety* I understand *grammar*, i.e. a linguistic *system* in its own right. Indeed, the data situation badly needs further investigation. In a paper on German dialect syntax dating from as early as 1909, we find the following remark: "It would for example be desirable to investigate, … how far southward the Northern German property of splitting up adverbs goes, for example *da hab' ich nichts von gewußt*" (Weise 1909:734-5).[6] To my knowledge, no investigation of this sort has ever been carried out.

To make things even more complicated, the construction seen so far sometimes seems to be in interaction with another construction: apart from the splitting up of pronominal adverbs, another construction exists which is claimed to occur in complementary distribution with the former. Prepositions with initial consonant are claimed to exhibit the stranding construction. If a preposition begins with a vowel, however, the stranding construction is claimed to be impossible; instead, the R-pronoun is doubled:

---

[6] "[Z]. B. wäre es wünschenswert zu untersuchen, … wie weit südwärts die norddeutsche Trennung der Adverbien [reicht], z. B. *da hab' ich nichts von gewußt* …". (Weise 1909:734-5)

In many dialects, sentences such as *Da freuen wir uns drauf/dran/drüber* are very widespread, but apart from that also sentences such as *Da haben wir nichts von/durch gelernt*. In the former case (prepositions with initial vowel) it looks as if a *da* has been added to the ›shortened‹ pronominal adverb *drauf* etc. in the prefield (›doubling construction‹). In the latter case (prepositions with initial consonant) the pronominal adverb seems to have been split up in such a manner that the adverb is in the prefield while the preposition is left behind (›preposition stranding‹). (Eisenberg 1999:195)[7]

It has been argued that such a complementary distribution might be in conflict with the hypothesis of the autonomy of syntax: "Given a conception of an autonomous syntax, as proposed in GB-theory, it is not possible to make the syntactic restructuring rule depend on a phonological property of the items concerned." (Oppenrieder 1990:163).[8]

As I have shown, not entirely clear in which variety the stranding construction really occurs. This is even less clear in the case of the doubling construction and still less clear in the case of the claimed complementary distribution of the two. Before going into detail of the analyses of these constructions, it is therefore necessary to check first of all where the various constructions actually occur. In addition to that, I will present some related constructions so far not touched upon, in order to get a fuller picture of the syntactic behaviour of pronominal adverbs.

2 ▪ THE SYNTAX OF PRONOMINAL ADVERBS IN GERMAN DIALECTS

Section 2 of this paper is based on Fleischer 1999, where I documented the geographical distribution of the different constructions involving pronominal adverbs. As the varieties for investigation, I chose the dialects of German. The term *dialect* is quite traditionally being restricted to the variety spoken by nonmobile

....
[7] "In vielen Dialekten sind Sätze wie *Da freuen wir uns drauf/dran/drüber* ganz verbreitet, daneben aber auch solche wie *Da haben wir nichts von/durch gelernt*. Im ersten Fall (vokalisch anlautende Pr) sieht es so aus, als sei zum ›verkürzten‹ Pronominaladverb *drauf* usw. noch ein *da* im Vorfeld getreten (›Verdoppelungskonstruktion‹). Im zweiten Fall (konsonantisch anlautende Pr) scheint das Pronominaladverb so aufgespalten zu sein, daß das Adverb im Vorfeld steht und die Pr zurückbleibt (›Preposition Stranding‹)." (Eisenberg 1999:195)
[8] "Bei einer autonomen Syntaxkonzeption, wie sie in der GB-Theorie vertreten wird, ist es nicht möglich, die syntaktische Restrukturierungsregel von einer phonologischen Eigenschaft der betroffenen Einheiten abhängig zu machen." (Oppenrieder 1990:163)

populations (see Chambers and Trudgill 1998:29). By relying on and restricting oneself to this type of data, differences with respect to geographical distribution should become apparent as clear-cut as possible. Since the area of my investigation covers the whole German speaking area, it was of course not possible to collect the data by direct elicitation or questionnaires. Instead, I had to rely exclusively on printed sources, namely on descriptive grammars of various dialects, on dictionaries, on transcriptions of sound recordings, and sometimes even on fiction written in dialect (the pros and cons of these different types of sources are discussed in Fleischer 1999:5-8). By relying on these four types of sources, it was sometimes possible to get a quite detailed picture of the geographical distribution of the different constructions. Nevertheless, in certain areas the data situation is better than in others, and in some it is still insufficient. The results presented here should therefore be regarded as preliminary, since the data base is still being extended.

For the description of the geographical distribution in which the different constructions occur, I will use the classification of German dialects (and use the dialect names) given by Wiesinger (1983). In the remaining parts of this paper, only data which show the different constructions if the R-pronoun 'da' is involved are considered; the R-pronouns 'wo' and 'hier' would display the same phenomena in a somewhat more restricted way. To include the syntactic behaviour of these R-pronouns would go beyond the scope of the present paper.

2.1 ▪ The Stranding Construction

In this paper, for constructions as seen in example (3), I will adopt the term *stranding construction*. In order to avoid confusion, I will adopt the term *liberal preposition stranding* for constructions similar to example (1), the 'classical case' of preposition stranding known from English (cf. section 2. 5).

The examples in (4) show the stranding construction with three different groups of prepositions: in example (4a) from North Saxon, the preposition begins with a vowel, in example (4b), from North Thuringian, the preposition begins with a consonant, and example (4c), from Rhine Franconian, shows a single preposition, namely 'mit' 'with', which forms a group of its own. If the preposition begins with a vowel, the stranding construction mainly occurs in the north of the German speaking area: it is attested in all Low German dialects, in Low Franconian, and also in

Ripuarian. As far as prepositions beginning with a consonant are concerned, the use of the stranding construction is a little further expanded to the south: examples like (4b) are found again in all Low German dialects and in Low Franconian, but also in Middle Franconian, in Rhine Franconian, in North Hessian, and in North Thuringian. So far, it has been shown that the construction appears to be restricted to the north and to some extent to the centre of the German speaking area. However, there is an important exception: one preposition, namely 'mit', displays a clear deviation from this pattern. Stranding constructions with this particular preposition occur in great parts of the German speaking area. Example (4c), as has already been mentioned before, comes from the Low Alemannic area, quite far to the south, where other stranding constructions are unknown. The geographical distribution of the stranding construction in connection with the preposition 'mit' can best be described *ex negativo*: I found examples like (4c) in all German dialects, exceptions being Bavarian and Highest Alemannic.

(4a)   *Dar* hebb ik nät *an* docht
       da habe ich nicht an gedacht
       there have I not of thought
       'I have not thought of it'

                                                          (Wiesenhann 1936:44)

(4b)   *do* weiß ich nischt *vunne*
       da weiß ich nichts von
       there know I nothing of
       'I know nothing of it'

                                                  (Thüringisches Wörterbuch VI:617)

(4c)   *Do¶* kane nigs *mit* ãfaN´´
       da kann=ich nichts mit anfangen
       there can=I nothing with begin
       'I cannot do anything with it / it does not mean a thing to me'
                                                  (Badisches Wörterbuch III:642)

2. 2 ▪ The Long R-Pronoun Doubling Construction

Apart from the preposition 'mit', the stranding construction is restricted to the north of the German speaking area. The construction which exhibits doubling of the R-pronoun (which I will call *long R-pronoun doubling construction*, or in short, *long doubling construction*) is associated with the south of the German speaking area: both examples in (5) are from Bavarian. If the preposition begins with a vowel, as in example (5a), the construction is possible in all High German dialects and also in Westphalian, while it is very rare in other Low German dialects. As far as prepositions beginning with a consonant are concerned, as in example (5b), the construction appears to be virtually restricted to High German dialects; in Low German dialects it is almost non-existent (in my material, I found only two counterexamples, both from the North Saxon dialect area; see Fleischer 1999:75, 80).

(5a) *då* howi gor ned *dro^n* denkt
da habe=ich gar nicht daran gedacht
there have=I at-all not there-of thought
'I have not thought of it at all'

<div align="right">(Bayerisches Wörterbuch I:387)</div>

(5b) *Do¶* woas i nix *davo^n*
da weiß ich nichts davon
there know I nothing there-of
'I do know nothing of it'

<div align="right">(Zehetner 1985:148)</div>

Example (5a) shows practically the same context as example (4a), except that in example (5a), the R-pronoun 'da' occurs twice; example (5b) shows exactly the same context as example (4b), again with the exception that the R-pronoun 'da' occurs twice in example (5b). From a comparative point of view, one could therefore claim that the two constructions are equivalent.

2. 3 ▪ *The Short R-Pronoun Doubling Construction*

The two constructions seen so far share the property that one R-pronoun is never adjacent to the preposition. In the examples (4) and (5), the first R-pronoun is always in the prefield, while the preposition follows far behind the inflected verb. The construction which is at issue in this section differs in this respect: the R-pronoun is again doubled, but the two R-pronouns occur in direct adjacency. For this construction I will use the term *short R-pronoun doubling construction*, or in short, *short doubling construction*. The short doubling construction appears in about the same geographical distribution as its long counterpart. If the preposition begins with a vowel, as in example (6a), it mainly occurs in High German dialects, and only in southern Low German dialects; if the preposition begins with a consonant, as in example (6b), it exclusively occurs in High German dialects, but in the High German area, it can be found quite far to the north (and east): example (6b), as well as example (6a), are from Silesian. I should add, however, that the short doubling construction with prepositions beginning with a consonant is also quite rare on the southern fringes of the German speaking area: in the archaic Highest Alemannic dialects spoken in the German speaking part of the Swiss *Kanton* Wallis, I found one single instance in a rather big corpus of transcribed sound recordings (cf. Fleischer 1999:16-7)[9], and it seems to be rarely occurring in Southern Bavarian, too.

(6a)   *dodrone* denkt er nicht
        dadaran denkt er nicht
        there-there-of thinks he not
        'he does not think of that'

                                        (Schlesisches Wörterbuch I:179)

(6b)   *Dodervone* weeß ich nischte
        dadavon weiß ich nichts
        there-there-of know I nothing
        'I do know nothing of it'

                                         (Menzel 1972:41)

The context in example (6a) is very similar to the context in examples (4a) and (5a), whereas example (6b) resembles examples (4b) and (5b). This strongly suggests that these different constructions are related to each other.

2. 4 ▪ *Orphan Prepositions*

In this section, I will present a construction that consists only of a preposition without any overt complement, which, however, is retrievable from the context. For this construction I will use the term *orphan preposition*.[10] In example (7a), from North Saxon, the preposition begins with a vowel; within this group of prepositions, I found the construction in all Low German dialects, but not in High German dialects. If the preposition begins with a consonant, as in example (7b), from Mecklenburgish, it occurs apart from all Low German dialects also in Low Franconian, in Middle Franconian, in North Hessian, and in North Thuringian. The preposition *mit*, however, constitutes a group of its own; example (7c) is from Low Alemannic, and I found analogous examples in all German dialects except Bavarian and Highest Alemannic.

(7a)   Dat hangt anne Wand un lett witt, un man dröögt sik de Han'n *in* af
        das hängt an=der Wand und lässt weiß, und man trocknet sich die Hände in ab
        that hangs on=the wall and lets white, and one dries oneself the hands in PRF
        'it hangs on the wall and looks white, and one dries one's hands with it'

                                                                            (Feyer 1939:27)

....
[9] These findings seem to be only partially confirmed by the material collected so far for the project of a syntactic atlas of Swiss German dialects (see Bucheli and Glaser, this volume). This could, however, be due to the method applied in this project.

[10] The term *orphan preposition* is borrowed from Zribi-Hertz 1984. It denotes a preposition without an overt complement, while no movement seems to be involved (which is assumed to be the case in stranding constructions). In a different meaning (namely denoting the phenomenon which today would be called *preposition stranding*), it seems to have first been used by Postal (see Zribi-Hertz 1984:33, note 2).

(7b)   ik nehm mi 'n bäten brod mit, dat ik *van* unnerwegens ok wat harr
        ich nehme mir einen Bissen Brot mit, dass ich von unterwegs auch was habe
        I take me a bite bread with, that I of on-the-way also something have
        'I take with me a bite of bread, in order to have something of it on the way'

                                                                (Wossidlo 1895:54)

(7c)   Bhalt dei^n Messer, ich kann nigs *mit* schneide!
        behalte dein Messer, ich kann nichts mit schneiden
        keep your knife, I can nothing with cut
        'keep your knife, I cannot cut anything with it'

                                                        (Badisches Wörterbuch I:412)

It is at first sight not easy to decide whether the missing complement of these orphan prepositions is preceding or following the preposition (should example (7a) be formalised as $[_{PP}$ in $[_{DP}\ \emptyset]]$ or rather as $[_{PP}\ [_{DP}\ \emptyset]$ in$]$)? However, we can find instances of simple pronominal adverbs in very similar syntactic environments where orphan prepositions also occur. Example (7a') is taken from the same source (and even from the same page) as example (7a) and shows a practically identical syntactic environment:

(7a')   Ja, aver Hinnerk, man dröögt sik doch de Han'n nich *drin* af!
        ja, aber *Hinnerk*, man trocknet sich doch die Hände nicht darin ab
        yes, but Hinnerk, *one dries oneself yet the hands not there-in* PRF
        'well, *Hinnerk*, but one does not dry one's hands with it'

                                                                (Feyer 1939:27)

Data like example (7a') strongly suggest that the empty complement is equivalent to an R-pronoun preceding the preposition, rather than to any other DP following it. In my sources there is even some evidence suggesting that orphan prepositions and simple pronominal adverbs are interchangeable. Thus, for the Alsatian Low Alemannic dialects we read: "Adverb *damit*, rarely used, mostly substituted by *mit*" (Wörterbuch der elsässischen Mundarten I:737).[11] Such an analysis is also justified

....
[11] "Adv. damit, selten gebr., meist steht dafür *mit*." (Wörterbuch der elsässischen Mundarten I:737)

from a comparative point of view: it has been observed that an orphan preposition in one variety is equivalent to a simple pronominal adverb in another. Thus, again for an Alsatian Low Alemannic dialect, the dialect of Colmar, we find the following remark: "In several expressions where German uses *damit*, Alsatian contents itself with a simple *mit*" (Muller 1983:260).[12]

Further evidence for this analysis comes from the fact that the R-pronoun *da* can be omitted if it is part of a stranding construction (this phenomenon should be regarded as a case of topic drop). Thus, we read in a grammar of North Saxon: "If a pronominal adverb is separated into its two components, the adverb can be omitted" (Lindow *et al.* 1998:274).[13] As an example, they provide the following sentence (brackets in the original):

(8)   [*Dar*] Kaamt se veel billiger *bi* weg
        da kommen sie viel billiger bei weg
        there come they much cheaper by away
        'this way, they get away much cheaper'

$$\text{(Lindow } et\ al.\ 1998:274)$$

The R-pronoun *da* can also be omitted if part of a long doubling construction. Example (9b), from Bavarian, shows a very similar context as example (5a), repeated here as (9a). But it is only the case in the first example that the R-pronoun in the prefield is phonetically realised:

(9a)   *då* howi gor ned *dro^n* denkt
        da habe=ich gar nicht daran gedacht
        there have=I at-all not there-of thought
        'I have not thought of it at all'

$$\text{(Bayerisches Wörterbuch I:387)}$$

(9b)   und na1 ha)1ma hoid a so ksÙno¶dad midana)1na, Ø de)Nge1 so o¶ft *dro*

....
[12] "[D]ans plus. locutions où l'all. dit *damit*, l'als. se contente d'un simple <u>*mit*</u> …" (Muller 1983:260)

und da haben=wir halt so geplaudert miteinander, denke=ich so oft daran

and then have=we just so chatted with-one-another, think=I so often there-of

'and then we just have chatted with one another, I so often think of it'

<div align="right">(Kollmer 1989:452)</div>

I therefore conclude that in the examples of orphan prepositions seen so far, the missing element is an R-pronoun, rather than another pronoun (or any DP) following the preposition. There are, however, other types of orphan prepositions where the missing element cannot be an R-pronoun, see section 3. 4 and especially note 22.

2. 5 ▪ *Liberal Preposition Stranding*

Contrary to what has been maintained in previous studies, there are also constructions in German (or, to be more exact: in some varieties of German) which are, if we consider the surface structure only, identical to the kind of preposition stranding known from Germanic SVO-languages. In a description of the syntax of the dialect of Glücksstadt, a town at the right bank of the river Elbe between Hamburg and the North Sea, belonging to the North Saxon dialect area, we find the following description: "If a word governed by a preposition is heavily stressed, it is placed without the preposition at the beginning and the preposition follows at the end of the sentence" (Bernhardt 1903:25).[14] In German dialects, this construction is quite rare, and yet it exists:[15] it occurs in Westphalian and North Saxon. Bernhardt (1903) provides the following example:

....

[13] "Wird ein Pronominaladverb … in seine beiden Bestandteile getrennt, kann das Adverb weggelassen werden …" (Lindow *et al*. 1998:274)

[14] "Ist ein von einer Präposition abhängiges Wort stark betont, so stellt man es ohne die Präposition an die Spitze und lässt die Präposition am Ende des Satzes folgen …" (Bernhardt 1903:25)

[15] Data structurally similar to example (10) have already been discussed briefly by Breindl (1989:139-40, note 28) and Oppenrieder (1990:160-1, note 4). Oppenrieder 1990 gives four examples from one source, whereas Breindl 1989 provides two sentences, but from different sources:

(i)   *Kostüme* sind unsere Frauen *für* verantwortlich   (Oppenrieder 1990:160)

         costumes are our wives responsible for

         'for costumes, our wives are responsible'

(ii)   Und jetzt willsde auf 58 Kilo dich runterhungern? – Och ja, *59* bin i auch schon *mit* zufrieden.

         (Breindl 1989: and now want-you on 58 kilos yourself down-hunger – oh well, 59 am I also already with happy, 139)

         'And now you want to starve yourself to 58 kilos? – Well, I am already happy with 59!'

(iii)   *Stetigkeit* muß ich mich *von* lösen   (Breindl 1989:139)

(10)   *een* heff ick genuch *an*

      eins habe ich genug an

      one have I enough on

      'one is enough for me'

<div align="right">(Bernhardt 1903:25)</div>

It should be noted that in German, this construction is restricted to the north-west. This fits rather well to the fact that in the vicinity of these German dialects other languages display this construction as well, as will be discussed in section 3. 5.

3 ▪ CONCLUSIONS FROM THE GEOGRAPHICAL FINDINGS; CONSEQUENCES FOR THE ANALYSES

After having clarified the data situation to some extent, I will now move on to the interpretation of the data. In the present paper, no comprehensive analyses of the different constructions will be offered. Rather, I will concentrate on an evaluation of

---

....

      steadiness must I myself from detach

      'from steadiness, I have to detach myself'

Interestingly though, it can be shown that these examples, although they consist of non-dialectal material, belong exactly to the same region as my dialectal material does. Oppenrieder's four sentences, one of which is example (i), are taken from short stories by a writer called Jürgen von Manger. He comes from Koblenz and Herne and "caricatures language and mentality of a man from the Ruhr area" (Sowinski 1997:382); the Ruhr area belongs to the Westphalian dialect area.

Example (ii), Breindl's first sentence to illustrate this construction, is taken from Brons-Albert (1984:29); it is indicated that the speaker's native dialect is Westphalian (Brons-Albert 1984:29). Finally, example (iii), Breindl's second example, is taken from Wichter (1980:38). In Wichter (1980:38) we learn that the sentence was heard by the author of the paper, unfortunately without any further local indication. However, we find that the author, at least at the time in question, is a resident of Bochum (Wichter 1980:50), which belongs also to the Westphalian area.

To sum up, the data discussed by Breindl 1989 and Oppenrieder 1990 originate from the same area where I found the liberal stranding construction. This gives even more support to the claim that these data shuold not be regarded as "planning errors and breaking-offs of constructions" ("Plan[u]ngsfehler und Konstruktionsabbrüche", Breindl 1989:139). I place some special emphasis on that because previous studies have tended not to do so, as this quotation clearly shows. The same holds, by the way, also for the Dutch equivalent of liberal preposition stranding (to be discussed in section 3. 5): "Nobody has ever proposed a transformational solution for the Dutch stranding cases. The reason for this is that such cases are and always have been considered ungrammatical" ("Niemand heeft ooit een transformationele oplossing voor de Nederlandse strandinggevallen voorgesteld. De reden daarvoor is, dat deze gevallen altijd als ongrammatikaal werden en worden beschouwd …", Jansen 1981:98).

some points which have been raised in previous studies, and complement with further interesting aspects of the constructions presented.

3. 1 ▪ *The Problem of the Complementary Distribution*

Oh the basis of my data, the complementary distribution of the stranding construction (prepositions with initial consonant) and the long doubling construction (prepositions with initial vowel) as suggested by Eisenberg (1999:195) among others cannot be confirmed. One would expect complementary distribution to occur in those geographical areas where the stranding construction only occurs with prepositions beginning with a consonant. This area (which is not the area where the complementary distribution really occurs, but where it is possible that it may occur) constitutes only a relatively small belt, comprising (from west to east) parts of the Rhine Franconian, Moselle Franconian, Hessian and Thuringian dialect areas. It could be the case that the systems of these dialects, displaying the stranding construction only with prepositions beginning with a consonant, are the result of contact phenomena. Thus, for those parts of Thuringian where the stranding construction is possible for prepositions beginning with a consonant, the following characterisation can be found: "According to tape recordings, this double use of *da* occurs everywhere in Thuringia, but is rarer in the dialects of the Eichsfeld and of North Thuringia, presumably because here the Low German rule of splitting up compounded adverbs is still at work" (Spangenberg 1993:256).[16]

This quotation only deals with the frequency of the doubling construction in an area where the stranding construction also occurs. But what about the aspect of complementary distribution? Interestingly, in my dialectal data, it simply does not occur. At first sight, especially if there is only limited material for a certain region, one may receive the impression that one deals with a system displaying complementary distribution. But then it quite often turns out that the stranding construction, as expected, is impossible with prepositions beginning with a vowel, whereas, on the other hand, the doubling construction is not impossible for prepositions beginning with a consonant. There is thus an asymmetry in such systems: prepositions beginning with a vowel only allow the long doubling construction, while prepositions

beginning with a consonant allow both the stranding construction and the long doubling construction. The differences between these two constructions within the group of prepositions beginning with a consonant are of a pragmatic nature (the stranding construction being unmarked). Thus, in the following Rhine Franconian examples, a special stress (marked by the author of this grammar by <··>) laid on a constituent other than the R-pronoun seems to give rise to a stranding construction, this case is illustrated in example (11a). If, however, an R-pronoun *da* is especially stressed, it seems to lead to a doubling construction, as in example (11b):

(11a)   'dr : "mi:r ,nid di: 'sax 'a:n | ᴅɔ : 'kan "i ,nigs *fç:r*

   drehe mir nicht die Sache an, da kann ich nichts für
   turn me not this thing PRF, *there can I nothing for*
   'do not blame me for this, it is not my fault'

<div align="right">(Steitz   1981:150)</div>

(11b)   "*dç:* kanÌi ,nigs *d´fç:r*
   da kann=ich nichts dafür
   there can=I nothing there-for
   'this is not my fault'

<div align="right">(Steitz   1981:151)[17]</div>

The postulated complementary distribution is sometimes motivated by a kind of "identity condition":

   "The moved *da* and the deleted expression have to correspond in what concerns their
   form … Exactly in the cases when the preposition begins with a vowel, these

....

[16] "Nach Tonbandaufnahmen ist dieser doppelte Gebrauch von 'da' in ganz Thüringen verbreitet, jedoch seltener im Eichsf und nNThür, weil hier vermutlich die nd. Regelung der Trennung von zusammengesetzten Adverbien noch nachwirkt …" (Spangenberg 1993:256)

[17] Steitz 1981 gives the following German translations of these examples (italics in the original): 'Schiebe *mir* nicht die Sache zu! *Dafür* kann *ich* nichts!' (= (11a); Steitz   1981:150); '*Da*, in diesem Fall, an diesem Ort, kann ich nichts dafür' (= (11b); Steitz   1981:151).

conditions are not fullfilled, because an -r- is placed between the pronominal *da* and the preposition … or there is no 'identical deletion'." (Oppenrieder 1990:166)[18]

This claim, however, is not supported by the empirical facts. The following two sentences come both from Mühlhausen, which is located in the northern part of the Thurinigan dialect area, where the standing construction and the long doubling construction may occur both (which is, as has been shown, relatively rare). However, the second sentence, displaying the long doubling construction, shows that the two R-Pronouns don't have to be "phonologically identical" at all :

(11c)   do kannste bie verdiene
        da kannst=du bei verdienen
        there can=you by gain
        'you can gain money with this'

(Thüringisches Wörterbuch I:635)

(11d)   dó fraisd du dn Deiwel drnóch
        da fragst du den Teufel danach
        there ask you the devil there=after
        'you don't care at all'

(Hertel 1895:40)

In the light of such data, the "deletion under identity" cannot be maintained.

3. 2 ▪ Verb Left Adjacency
In examples (4a)-(4c) and (5a)-(5b), the preposition, stranded or to the right of an R-pronoun, always appears to the left of the verb. As a matter of fact, this seems to be the usual position of the preposition and gives rise to the following claim: "Verb left adjacency is indispensable, as shown in [(12a)-(12c)], and is probably due to the

....
[18] "Das verschobene *da* und der getilgte Ausdruck müssen in ihrer Form übereinstimmen; … Genau in den Fällen mit vokalisch anlautender Präposition sind diese Bedingungen nicht erfüllt, da zwischen dem pronominalen *da* und der Präposition ein -r- eingeschoben ist…" (Openrieder 1990:166)

canonical government direction of the verb in German (and Dutch/Frisian)."
(Abraham 1995:337).[19] Abraham 1995 gives the following set of data:

(12a) *Da* will ich nicht *drüber* SPRECHEN

there want I not there-over speak

'I do not want to talk about it'

(Abraham 1995:337)

(12b) *Da will ich *drüber* nicht sprechen   (Abraham 1995:337)

(12c) *Da will ich nicht sprechen *drüber*   (Abraham 1995:337)

However, the claimed ungrammaticality of structures like in example (12b) and (12c)
cannot be supported by empirical evidence. Abraham's grammaticality judgements
can be falsified, as shown in example (12b'), from Bavarian, and example (12c'), from
East Franconian:

(12b') do¶ ha)1mar a za¶idlã1N a ros ko¶d, an sÙime1; *do¶ hã¶ma damíd* seiwa a¶v SÛtra¶uwen

kfo¶n

da sind=wir eine Zeit-lang ein Pferd gehabt, einen Schimmel; da haben=wir
damit selber auf Straubing gefahren

there have=we a time-long a horse had, a white-horse; there have=we there-with self to
Straubing driven

'for some time we had a white horse; we rode it to Straubing ourselves'

(Kollmer 1989:468)

....
[19] "Verblinksadjazenz ist unverzichtbar, wie (46) zeigt, und geht aller Wahrscheinlichkeit nach auf die
kanonische Verbrektionsrichtung im Deutschen (und Niederländisch/Friesischen) zurück." (Abraham

(12c') *då* håt er niks gsåcht *driwer*

da hat er nichts gesagt darüber

there has he nothing said there-about

'he did not say anything about it'

<div align="right">(Beyschlag and Werner 1961:217)</div>

While examples like (12b') are not frequent, examples like (12c') are encountered less rarely as one might expect. Data like the b- and c-examples represent strong empirical evidence against an analysis which is based on incorporation of the preposition into the verb. Such an analysis could explain why the R-pronoun is allowed to be separated from the preposition: because the latter, after being incorporated into the verb, would no longer govern the R-pronoun (instead, it would be governed by the complex verb, and verbs allow their complements to be non-adjacent). However, such an analysis, although very attractive, cannot be maintained in the light of empirical findings.

3.3 ▪ *The Emergence of Orphan Prepositions*

As was shown in section 2. 4 by a comparison of example (7a) and (7a'), it is possible to have a simple pronominal adverb instead of an orphan preposition: both constructions appear to be syntactically equivalent. However, one receives the impression that the simple pronominal adverb is the unmarked and the orphan preposition is the marked construction. The question now arises as to whether the emergence of orphan prepositions is caused by phonological or grammatical factors. There are some indications for the former; thus we read for example in a sketch of the syntax of Low German in general (remember that orphan prepositions equivalent to simple pronominal adverbs occur chiefly in Low German dialects): "There are forms which lack the pro-element. Certain signs indicate that it disappeared because of the tonal weakness. — Thus, there are examples, where it exists only rudimentarily" (Saltveit 1983:323).[20] It is likely that reduced forms of the R-pronoun led to orphan prepositions; at least, in recent Low German dialects we find side by side non-reduced

....
1995:337)

[20] "Es gibt Formen, denen das eigentliche Pro-Element fehlt. Gewisse Anzeichen sprechen dafür, daß es wegen der Tonschwäche geschwunden ist. — So gibt es Belege, in denen es nur rudimentär vorhanden ist …" (Saltveit 1983:323)

R-pronouns, reduced R-pronouns (the reduction going to different extents), and orphan prepositions. This is indicated by the following quotation which deals with the phonetic properties of pronominal adverbs in the North Saxon dialect of Hamburg: "In most instances, the second part is stressed; in this case *dor* may be shortened to *da*, *do*, *'er*, *'r*, or *dor* lacks entirely" (Hamburgisches Wörterbuch I:609).[21] This scale from non-reduced R-pronouns to orphan prepositions could represent a diachronic development.

Reduced forms of the R-pronoun are illustrated in examples (13a) and (13b); example (13a) shows that a reduced and a non-reduced R-pronoun adjacent to the preposition may occur in the same syntactic environment; example (13b) shows that a reduced R-pronoun may also occur in a stranding construction:

(13a)　He plöögt un will*'r bi* / will *darbi* bliben
　　　　er pflügt und will=da bei / will dabei bleiben
　　　　he ploughs and wants=there by / wants there-by stay
　　　　'he is ploughing and he wants to go on'

<div align="right">(Niedersächsisches Wörterbuch III:91)</div>

(13b)　snackt hebbt se *'r* mol *van*
　　　　gesprochen hat sie da mal von
　　　　spoken has she there once of
　　　　'she once has spoken of it'

<div align="right">(Hamburgisches Wörterbuch I:630)</div>

To sum up, for the Low German dialects there is some evidence that the emergence of orphan prepositions may be conditioned by phonological developments. We should remember, however, that orphan prepositions, as far as the preposition 'mit' is concerned, occur in an area far bigger than the Low German area (see section 2. 4). And for the High German dialects, I found no evidence for the existence of reduced R-pronoun forms comparable to the ones seen in examples (13a) and (13b). At least in

....
[21] "Meist wird der zweite Teil betont; *do@r* kann dann zu *da, do, 'er, 'r* gekürzt sein, … oder *do@r* fehlt ganz …" (Hamburgisches Wörterbuch I:609)

the case of 'mit', a purely phonological explanation will not do. The non-appearance of the R-pronoun may in this case be better explained as deletion. As was seen at the end of section 2. 4, an R-pronoun in the prefield may be deleted. Therefore, we have to take into account deletion of an R-pronoun as a mechanism independent of the phonological developments just seen.

3.4 ▪ *The Special Case of the Preposition 'mit'*

Compared to the other prepositions, the deviant behaviour of the preposition 'mit' with regard to the stranding construction and the orphan preposition construction emerged in a surprisingly evident manner from my material: the preposition 'mit' allows these constructions in High Alemannic, Low Alemannic, Swabian, East Franconian, Upper Saxon, and Silesian. In all these dialects the stranding construction and the orphan preposition construction are totally unknown with prepositions other than 'mit' (this also holds, apart from the dialects already listed up, for wide parts of the Rhine Franconian, the Central Hessian, and the Thuringian dialect areas). For the time being, I cannot offer a convincing explanation why the preposition 'mit' exhibits such deviant behaviour from other preposition. However, I found a remark dealing with the prepositions *mit* and *ooni* ('without')[22] in the High Alemannic dialect of

....
[22] Until now, I have not mentioned the preposition 'ohne' ('without'), for a very simple reason: as we can learn from the table in section 1, there simply is no pronominal adverb 'darohne'. This is the reason why this preposition is not involved in the constructions presented in this paper. This view, however, now deserves some modification. In some dialects, most of them located in the south-west of the German speaking area, I found the form 'darohne' (see Fleischer 1999:11, 19, 23, 59, 79). For Moselle Franconian and Ripuarian, even the form *do4@d´ro4@:nt* (Rheinisches Wörterbuch I:1208), illustrating the short doubling construction in connection with the preposition 'ohne', is attested. Nevertheless, the form 'darohne' is very rare in the dialects of German, and it is nonexistent in most of them. However, this preposition can also occur without any overt complement in varieties which do not have a pronominal adverb 'darohne'. This is illustrated by the following sentences from the High Alemannic dialect of Zürich in example (i), and from (the Swiss version of) the German Standard language (example (ii) is taken from a newspaper article which appeared in the *Neue Zürcher Zeitung* 246 (2000): 115); in both varieties there is no form 'darohne':

(i)   ɣaʒ nyyt maɣə ooni (z)

        'you-can nothing do without it'   (Riemsdijk 1975:196)
(ii)   Auf den Kolchosen lagerten die Inlandpässe im Schrank des Direktors; ohne Ø konnte man
        nicht abhauen on the kolkhozes lied the domestic-passports in-the cupboard of-the director;
        without could one not break-out 'on the kolkhozes, the domestic passports were kept in the
        director's cupboard; without them you were not able to break out'
This is clear evidence that apart from the type of orphan preposition seen in section 2. 4, where the missing element was equivalent to an R-pronoun, there is another type of orphan preposition, where

Zürich: "To find that it is these two prepositions that behave exceptionally is not too surprising, since they do so in other languages as well." (Riemsdijk 1975:196). In his paper, Riemsdijk shows that the complement of the prepositions 'mit' and 'ohne', contrary to other prepositions, can be missing in relative clauses, in sentence final position, in elliptic idiomatic expression, and in gapping constructions (see Riemsdijk 1975:196-7). As an example of elliptic idiomatic expressions, the following sentences involving the preposition 'mit' are given:

(14a)   wo biZ an´ mit (´m)?
        where are-you to with it
        'Where did you take it?'

                                                                    (Riemsdijk 1975:196)

(14b)   iZ daz mit (zErvis etc.)?
        'is that with service'

                                                                    (Riemsdijk 1975:196)

It may be debated whether the lacking element in Riemsdijk's first example quoted above constitutes a real equivalent to a personal pronoun of the third person singular neuter in the dative case: if one has to refer to an inanimate entity, and this is strongly suggested by Riemsdijk's translation "with it", one would rather take an R-pronoun, at least in my personal competence of Zürich German. I do not think, however, that example (14a) is acceptable if referring to a person. Rather, it seems to me that example (14a) is a further example of the orphan preposition construction seen in section 2. 4 (which is, by the way, not treated in Riemsdijk 1975). This view is confirmed by the fact that examples similar to (14a) are subsumed under *damit* in the Schweizerisches Idiotikon (IV:560).[23] Nevertheless, it is evident that Riemsdijk's

....
the missing element has to be equivalent to something else. It is beyond the scope of the present paper to decide whether these findings may also shed some light on the deviant behaviour of 'mit', the semantic opposite of 'ohne'.

[23] The same objection also holds for another example given in Riemsdijk 1975, illustrating the behaviour of 'mit' in a relative clause:

(xxi)   də vrynd wo mər aməl zind go t uute mit hæt khyraatə
        'the friend WH we used-to are to play-socker with has married' (Riemsdijk 1975:196)

analysis of example (14b) is correct: in this case, the preposition 'mit' allows dropping of a full DP complement. The conclusion that the preposition 'mit', for whatever reasons, exhibits a different behaviour than other prepositions, with respect to a number of phenomena, is therefore justified at least for Zürich German, and this will most probably hold also for other varieties of German.

To conclude this section, I think that we have to take into account the special semantic and syntactic behaviour of the preposition 'mit'. In order to explain the possibility of the orphan preposition construction and the stranding construction in connection with this particular preposition, at least for the areas where these constructions are unknown otherwise, this seems to be a better solution than to seek for a phonological explanation. Referring to phonological developments might account for the emergence of the orphan preposition construction in the Low German dialects. There it seems possible with all prepositions which allow an R-pronoun as their complement. For the deviant behaviour of the preposition 'mit', however, we have to find another explanation (see also section 3. 3).

3.5 ▪ *Emergence of Liberal Preposition Stranding*

....
I doubt whether this example is really acceptable if it refers to a human being (which has to be the case here). I found examples structurally similar to example (i), but only with inanimate entities involved, where one would rather use an R-pronoun instead of a personal pronoun (see example (ii); usually, instead of *mit* one would say *demit*, while *mit ere*, using a personal pronoun referring to the DP *e Taktik*, is uncommon). This suggests that here again, we are dealing with an empty element equivalent to an R-pronoun.

(ii)   das isch e Taktik, *wo* si offebaar susch Erfolg hät *mit*   (Zürich, spontaneous speech)
         das ist eine Taktik, wo sie offenbar sonst Erfolg hat mit
         that is a tactic, where she obviously otherwise success has with
         'that is a strategy which she obviously is usually successful with'

Two grammars of dialects not far away from Zürich, namely of Zug and of Luzern, are also quite explicit when it comes to determining the missing element. The following examples contain the original notation or remark, respectively, suggesting that the missing element is an R-pronoun:

(iii)   De Hammer, *won* er de Naagel inegschlaage hed (*de-*)*mit*   (Bossard 1962:142)
         der Hammer, wo er den Nagel hineingeschlagen hat (da-)mit
         the hammer, where he the nail knocked-in has (there-)with
         'the hammer, which he has knocked in the nail with'

(iv)   Daas esch di Flente, *won* er ne Vògel *met* (statt «*demit*») gschòsse hëëd   (Fischer 1960:430)
         das ist die Flinte, wo er einen Vogel mit (statt «damit») geschossen hat
         that is the rifle, where he a bird with (instead of «there-with») shot has
         'that is the rifle which he has shot a bird with'

At the end of section 2. 5, I pointed out that liberal preposition stranding in German is rare and restricted to north-western dialects. If we look beyond the borders of German, however, we see that it also occurs in neighbouring languages. It is, of course, found in Danish, as well as in other Germanic SVO-languages, but it also occurs in Germanic SOV-languages. This is illustrated for the North Frisian dialect of the Mittelgoesharde in example (15a), and for West Frisian in example (15b). Finally, liberal preposition stranding also occurs in Dutch varieties, namely in spoken Dutch: "Stranding sentences may only be used in the spoken language" (Jansen 1981:92)[24]; for spoken Dutch, this construction is illustrated in example (15c).

(15a) *de grote* weel üüs Mem niks *fun* wääs
        the big wants our mother nothing of know
        'our mother does not want to know anything of the big ones'

<div align="right">(Grünberg, Schlåchti 38)[25]</div>

(15b) *dy sifers* haw ik my slim *oer* fernuvere
        those figures have I myself much about puzzled
        'I have wondered much about those figures'

<div align="right">(Hoekstra and Tiersma 1994:527)</div>

(15c) *dat mes* kan ik niet *mee* snijden
        this knife can I not/nothing with cut
        'I cannot cut anything with this knife'

<div align="right">(Jansen 1981:93)</div>

In the remaining part of this section, I would like to show how liberal preposition stranding may be related to the stranding construction. My argument is based on

....

[24] "[I]n tegenstelling tot de andere vooropplaatsingsverschijnselen die allemaal zowel in schrijftaal als spreektaal voorkwamen, mogen strandingzinnen alleen in de spreektaal gebruikt worden." (Jansen 1981:92)

[25] I am grateful to Jarich Hoekstra for providing me with this example. It is taken from a manuscript entitled *Schlåchti* by Peter Grünberg, who was a native speaker of *Mittelgoesharder Friesisch*. The manuscript is kept by Nils Århammar, and the Nordfriesische Wörterbuchstelle, Christian-Albrechts-Universität zu Kiel has a copy of this text, which will be published alongside with other manuscripts from the same author by Jarich Hoekstra.

recent German dialect data, but it can also be understood as representing a diachronic line, leading thus to a theory of development of liberal preposition stranding.

In North Saxon and Westphalian, I found sentences like (16a). In this North Saxon example, there is a full DP in a kind of left-dislocation, and this DP is followed by an R-pronoun which is part of a stranding construction. Example (16b), from Westphalian, shows the same construction, with only one very small difference: there is no comma anymore between the initial DP and the R-pronoun. It is very difficult to judge whether this feature is really indicative of a systematic difference. A possible explanation would be that the comma in example (16a) indicates a comma intonation, showing that the DP *de eerste Fro* is in a position which may be called pre-prefield, whereas in example (16b), one gets the impression that the seemingly left-dislocated DP belongs to the same intonational unit as the rest of the sentence. This would mean that here, the DP is in the prefield, together with the following R-pronoun. (There is some empirical evidence to support the postulated intonational pattern. I will return to this point further below.) Anyway, if in a sentence like (16b) the R-pronoun is dropped, we are left with a sentence identical to example (10), repeated here as (16c):

(16a)   de eerste Fro, *do#r* hett he fief Görn *mit*
        die erste Frau, da hat er fünf Kinder mit
        the first wife, there has he five children with
        'from his first wife, he has got five children'

                                            (Hamburgisches Wörterbuch I:620)

(16b)   e¶ⁱn ᶜʰla#s *do#* heww-ik ᶜʰenaᵘch *ane*
        ein Glas da habe=ich genug an
        one glass there have=I enough on
        'one glass is enough for me'

                                                    (Grimme 1922:130)

(16c)   *een* heff ick genuch *an*
        eins habe ich genug an

one have I enough on

'one is enough for me'

<div align="right">(Bernhardt 1903:25)</div>

We already saw in example (16c) that liberal preposition stranding also occurs in spoken Dutch (see above); and the same holds for structures like example (16b), they occur in spoken Dutch as well (see Jansen 1981:157).

There is yet another development which I believe to be quite parallel to the one just seen. There are examples very similar to the ones in (16), but there is one major difference: the first constituent is not a DP, but a whole PP. In example (17a), from Eastphalian, we find a left-dislocated PP which is followed by an R-pronoun involved in a stranding construction. In example (17b), from North Saxon, we have the same construction, with only one difference: there is again no comma between the initial PP and the R-pronoun, as was the case in example (16b). If the R-pronoun disappears, one is left with a structure as represented in example (17c), from North Saxon: a PP in sentence-initial position, the preposition of which is repeated without any overt complement, is in a position after the inflected verb. This construction will subsequently be referred to as *preposition doubling*.

(17a) an disse ollen Murker, *då* is doch gårnich so veel *anne*!
       an diesen alten Maurern, da ist doch gar-nicht so viel an
       on these old bricklayers, there is really at-all-not so much on
       'there is nothing so special about these old bricklayers'

<div align="right">(Bethge and Flechsig 1958 3:16-7)</div>

(17b) in dat Glas *dar* weer nix mehr *in*
       in das Glas da war nichts mehr in
       in the glass there was nothing more in
       'there was nothing left in the glass'

<div align="right">(Hamburgisches Wörterbuch I:619)</div>

(17c) *van Vöörgeschichten* kann ik wal wat *van* vertellen
       von Vorgeschichten kann ich wohl was von erzählen

of past histories can I well something of tell
'I can very well tell something about past histories'

<div align="right">(Niedersächsisches Wörterbuch IV:40)</div>

Preposition doubling also occurs in spoken Dutch, but seemingly only in a quite restricted way (see Jansen 1981:157-8).

If we look at the developments just sketched, leading to liberal preposition stranding and to preposition doubling, it is obvious that we deal with processes quite different from preposition stranding in SVO-languages (where it is commonly assumed that movement of the DP out of the PP is involved). This fits well with the analysis Hoekstra (1995) has suggested for liberal preposition stranding in West Frisian: "[T]he full DP in sentence-initial position cannot have been moved from PP. The obvious solution is to assume that it is base-generated in Spec-CP, from where it binds an empty resumptive R-pronoun in the postpositional complement position." (Hoekstra 1995:99). Put into a formalisation, his analysis looks as follows:

(18) $[_{CP} DP_i [_{C'} \ldots [_{PP} pro_i P] \ldots]]$ (Hoekstra 1995:99)
                    [+R]

I think that the Low German data presented in this section should also be analysed in a similar way. However, after what has been presented, I would rather like to propose that the empty resumptive R-pronoun is in the prefield, and does not need to be adjacent to the preposition. In any case, it is clear that although the surface structure of liberal preposition stranding is identical to preposition stranding in English, the process of syntactic derivation leading to it is quite different.[26]

The emergence of liberal preposition stranding and of preposition doubling can be traced back to a more general peculiarity of the varieties displaying this particular

....
[26] It could be possible, however, that structures like (18) may get reanalysed: *pro* is exchanged by a trace which has to be in the canonical complement position of the preposition, that is, to its right. This might have happened in the history of English. In Old English, the type of preposition stranding called *stranding construction* in the present paper is attested (see Behaghel 1932:237), but this type does not exist anymore in Modern English. The reason is simple: apart from some fossilised forms as for example *therefore* or *whereby*, no pronominal adverbs exist anymore. If, for whatever reasons, R-pronouns (or at least their syntactic behaviour) disappear, this will hold all the more for their phonetically empty counterparts, forcing the reanalysis described above. Such a reanalysis did not take place in the continental West Germanic languages, but it could if R-pronouns disappeared.

construction. Precisely these varieties seem to allow the resumption of seemingly left-dislocated constituents in a quite liberal way. Thus, we find the following description in a grammar of North Saxon: "A part of the sentence can occur more than once. In such cases, the subject, an object, or an adverbial are expressed a second time by a following pronoun, pronominal adverb, or adverb. This doubling often serves as a means of emphasising." (Lindow *et al*. 1998:287).[27] Among the examples provided in this grammar, there are sentences like example (19), which involves a demonstrative pronoun, but apart from that, there are also sentences like example (20), showing a construction structurally equivalent to example (16b):

(19)   De Tiet *de* löppt
       die Zeit die läuft
       the time this runs
       'time flies

                                                          (Lindow *et al*. 1998:287)

(20)   De Sieverssch *dar* ward in Baasdörp veel *över* snackt
       die Sieversschen da wird in *Baasdörp* viel über gesprochen
       the Sievers there is in Baasdörp *much over talked*
       'about the Sievers family, they talk a lot in *Baasdörp*

                                                          (Lindow *et al*. 1998:287)

The demonstrative pronoun in example (19) is exactly in the same position as the R-pronoun in example (20). As I have already mentioned, the fact that there is no comma between the initial DP and the following pronoun gives rise to the assumption that the DP belongs to the same intonational unit as the rest of the sentence, examples (19) and (20) thus having no comma intonation. This would mean that the seemingly left-dislocated DPs are not in the pre-prefield but in the prefield,

....
[27] "Ein Satzglied kann mehrfach besetzt werden. In diesen Fällen werden das Subjekt, ein Objekt oder eine Adverbialbestimmung durch ein folgendes Pronomen, Pronominaladverb oder Adverb ein zweites Mal ausgedrückt. Diese Doppelung dient oft der Hervorhebung." (Lindow *et al*. 1998:287)

together with the following pronoun.[28] For my Low German data, this conclusion is admittedly somewhat tentative. Apart from the missing comma, I have no further empirical evidence concerning the intonational pattern in examples like (19) and (20). In Dutch, however, there are sentences which are structurally identical to example (19):

(21)   een boer *die* heeft altijd werk
        'a farmer that-one has always work'   (Jansen 1980:142)

This example is taken from Jansen 1980, where some findings of a corpus-based study are presented, the corpus containing about 19,000 sentences of spoken Dutch (Jansen 1980:141). Jansen calls a construction as seen in example (21) *Dem-LD* (*LD* stands for left-dislocation, and since this type of left-dislocation involves a demonstrative pronoun, *Dem* is added). It is now interesting what Jansen has to say about the intonation of such sentences:

> The most important feature of Modern Dem-LD is its intonation. The actual intonation found contrasts with descriptions of LD based on intuitions (Van Riemsdijk and Zwarts 1974; Koster 1978). Such descriptions invariably give a comma intonation between the LD-element and the sentence; however, I found this intonation in only 15% of the LD-sentences. Thus, there is no reason to assume that the LD-element is set off from the remainder of the sentence by comma intonation. (Jansen 1980:142)

Jansen's description shows clearly that the intonational pattern postulated in the present paper for North Saxon and Westphalian in examples like (16b), (17b), (19), and (20), exists in another language. One should not forget that this other language is closely related and neighbouring the north-western dialects of German. I take this as an important argument in favour of my analysis of liberal preposition stranding and of preposition doubling.

However, there is one serious problem which should not go unmentioned: despite the empirical evidence that a seemingly left-dislocated constituent and the following

....
[28] I might be the case "that the prosodic argument which invites such a solution is not strong enough", as one reviewer points out. However, I can't think of another diagnostic which would allow to decide whether or not a DP is integrated in the following CP.

pronoun may occur together in the prefield, forming thus one constituent, up to the present I cannot see how this could be formalised. As a solution to this problem, postulating an adjunction structure might probably lead to an adequate analysis.

4 ▪ CONCLUDING REMARKS

In my study on preposition stranding and related constructions, I have collected a whole range of empirical evidence for a better understanding of a construction which has been paid wide attention in theoretically oriented studies. However, I have to confess that I sometimes get the impression that the bigger the amount of data gets, the less clear seem to me the theoretical consequences to be drawn from the former. To illustrate this, we should bear in mind the findings concerning the geographical occurrence of the stranding construction. Disregarding the special behaviour of the preposition 'mit', we find one big area (mainly Low German) where this construction occurs with all primary prepositions, and another big area (mainly High German), where this construction does not occur. These systems are homogeneous. However, there is a belt between these two areas, where the stranding construction is restricted to one group of prepositions, namely the ones beginning with a consonant. Seen from the perspective of traditional dialect geography, which intends to document variation and areal transitions, such findings make sense. But how should a transitional belt such as the one just described be treated in a formal theory?

This study is not the place of a general discussion of the problem sketched. It has to be mentionned, however, that this problem has already been recognised in pre-generative frameworks, for example by William G. Moulton, who was probably the first to integrate and interpret large amounts of dialectal data within a formal framework, namely data collected for the *Sprachatlas der deutschen Schweiz* in structuralist phonology: "There is always a bit of messiness at the transitions between two systems, and it is precisely the dialectologist who has to face up to this obvious fact." (Moulton 1968:458).

■ REFERENCES

Abraham, Werner (1995). *Deutsche Syntax im Sprachenvergleich. Grundlegung einer typologischen Syntax des Deutschen*. Tübingen: Gunter Narr Verlag. [*Studien zur deutschen Grammatik* 41]

Badisches Wörterbuch. Begonnen und bearbeitet von Ernst Ochs, fortgesetzt von Karl Friedrich Müller, weitergeführt und bearbeitet von Gerhard W. Baur. Lahr / Schwarzwald: Verlag Moritz Schauenburg. 1925-.

Bayer, Joseph (1990). Interpretive Islands. In *Scrambling and Barriers*, ed. Günther Grewendorf and Wolfgang Sternefeld, 341-421. Amsterdam: Benjamins.

—— 1994. *Barriers for German*. Ms., Universität Stuttgart.

Bayerisches Wörterbuch. Bearbeitet von Josef Denz, Bernd Dieter Insam, Anthony R. Rowley und Hans Ulrich Schmid. München: R. Oldenbourg Verlag. 1995-.

Behaghel, Otto (1932). *Deutsche Syntax. Eine geschichtliche Darstellung. Band IV: Wortstellung. Periodenbau*. Heidelberg: Carl Winters Universitätsbuchhandlung.

Bernhardt, J. (1903). Zur Syntax der gesprochenen Sprache. *Jahrbuch des Vereins für niederdeutsche Sprachforschung* 29:1-25.

Bethge, Wolfgang, and Werner Flechsig (1958). Mascherode. Kreis Braunschweig. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht. [*Lautbibliothek der deutschen Mundarten* 3]

Beyschlag, Siegfried, and Otmar Werner (1961). Ostfranken erzählen. Tonbandaufnahmen aus Feuchtwangen und Umgebung. In *Festschrift Ernst Schwarz II*, ed. Karl Hauck, Hubert Rumpel, and Hugo Steger, 197-223. Kallmünz-Opf: Michael Laßleben. [*Jahrbuch für Fränkische Landesforschung* 21]

Bossard, Hans (1962). *Zuger Mundartbuch*. Zürich: Schweizer Spiegel Verlag. [*Grammatiken und Wörterbücher des Schweizerdeutschen* 4]

Breindl, Eva (1989). *Präpositionalobjekte und Präpositionalobjektsätze im Deutschen*. Tübingen: May Niemeyer Verlag. [*Linguistische Arbeiten* 220]

Brons-Albert, Ruth (1984). *Gesprochenes Standarddeutsch. Telefondialoge*. Tübingen: Gunter Narr Verlag. [*Studien zur deutschen Grammatik* 18]

Chambers, J.K., and Peter Trudgill (1998). *Dialectology. Second Edition*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Duden Grammatik. (1998). *Grammatik der deutschen Gegenwartssprache. 6., neu bearbeitete Auflage*. Herausgegeben von der Dudenredaktion. Bearbeitet von Peter Eisenberg, Hermann Gelhaus, Helmut Henne, Horst Sitta und Hans Wellmann. Mannheim, Leipzig, Wien, Zürich: Dudenverlag.

Eisenberg, Peter (1999). *Grundriß der deutschen Grammatik. Band 2: Der Satz*. Stuttgart, Weimar: Verlag J. B. Metzler.

Fanselow, Gisbert (1983). *Zu einigen Problemen von Kasus, Rektion und Bindung in der deutschen Syntax*. Magisterarbeit, Universität Konstanz.

—— (1991). *Minimale Syntax*. Habilitationsschrift, Universität Passau.

Feyer, Ursula (1939). *Deutsche Mundarten. Nordniedersächsisch aus Oldenburg (Friesische Wede und Ammerland*. Leipzig: Otto Harrassowitz. [*Arbeiten aus dem Institut für Lautforschung an der Universität Berlin* 5]

Fischer, Ludwig (1960). *Luzerndeutsche Grammatik*. Zürich: Schweizer Spiegel Verlag. [*Grammatiken und Wörterbücher des Schweizerdeutschen* 2]

Fleischer, Jürg (1999). *Zur Verteilung von Preposition Stranding und Resumptive Pronoun Doubling im Deutschen. Eine dialektsyntaktische Untersuchung*. Lizentiatsarbeit, Universität Zürich.

Gallmann, Peter (1997). Zu Morphosyntax und Lexik der w-Wörter. Universität Stuttgart, Universität Tübingen. [*Arbeitspapiere des Sonderforschungsbereichs 340* 107]

Grewendorf, Günther (1988). *Aspekte der deutschen Syntax. Eine Rektions-Bindungs-Analyse*. Tübingen: Gunter Narr Verlag. [*Studien zur deutschen Grammatik* 33]

—— (1989). *Ergativity in German*. Dordrecht: Foris.

Grimme, Hubert (1922). *Plattdeutsche Mundarten. Zweite, durchgesehene Auflage*. Berlin, Leipzig: Vereinigung wissenschaftlicher Verleger Walter de Gruyter & Co. [*Sammlung Göschen* 461]

Hamburgisches Wörterbuch. Aufgrund der Vorarbeiten von Christoph Walther und Agathe Lasch bearbeitet von Käthe Scheel und Jürgen Meier. Neumünster: Karl Wachholtz Verlag. 1985-.

Hertel, Ludwig (1895). *Thüringer Sprachschatz. Sammlung mundartlicher Ausrrücke aus Thüringen, nebst Einleitung, Sprachkarte und Sprachproben*. Weimar: Böhlau.

Hoekstra, Jarich (1995). Preposition Stranding and Resumptivity in West Germanic. In *Studies in Comparative Germanic Syntax*, ed. Hubert Haider, Susan Olsen, and Sten Vikner, 95-118. Dordrecht: Kluwer Academic Publishers. [*Studies in Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 31]

Hoekstra, Jarich, and Peter Meijes Tiersma (1994). Frisian. In *The Germanic Languages*, ed. Ekkehard König and Johan van der Auwera, 505-531. London, New York: Routledge.

Hopper, Paul J., and Elizabeth Close Traugott (1993). *Grammaticalization*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Hornstein, Norbert, and Amy Weinberg (1981). Case Theory and Preposition Stranding. *Linguistic Inquiry* 12:55-91.

Jansen, Frank (1980). Developments in the Dutch Left-Dislocation Structures and the Verb-Second Constraint. In *Papers from the 4th International Congress on Historical Linguistics*, ed. Elizabeth Close Traugott, Rebecca Labrum, and Susan Shepherd, 137-149. Amsterdam: John Benjamins B.V. [*Current Issues in Linguistic Theory* 14]

—— (1981). *Syntaktische konstrukties in gesproken taal*. Amsterdam: Huis an de drie grachten.

Kollmer, Michael (1989). *Die schöne Waldlersprach. Von Wegscheid bis Waldmünchen, von Passau bis Regensburg. 3. Band: Waldler erzählen (Texte in der Waldlersprache mit hochdeutscher Übertragung)*. Prackenbach: Eigenverlag.

Koster, Jan (1978). *Locality Principles in Syntax*. Doctoral Dissertation, University of Goningen.

—— (1987). *Domains and Dynasties*. Dordrecht: Foris.

Lindow, Wolfgang, Dieter Möhn, Hermann Niebaum, Dieter Stellmacher, Hans Taubken, and Jan Wirrer (1998). *Niederdeutsche Grammatik*. Leer: Verlag Schuster. [*Schriften des Instituts für niederdeutsche Sprache. Reihe Dokumentation* 20]

Menzel, Wilhelm (1972). *Mundart und Mundartdichtung in Schlesien*. München: Delp'sche Verlagsbuchhandlung. [*Silesia* 10]

Moulton, William G. (1968). Structural Dialectology. *Language* 44:451-466.

Müller, Gereon. 1991. Abstrakte Inkorporation. In *DET, COMP und INFL*, ed. Susan Olsen and Gisbert Fanselow:155-202. Tübingen: Niemeyer.

—— (2000). Das Pronominaladverb als Reparaturphänomen. *Linguistische Berichte* 182:139-178.

Muller, Robert (1983). *Le parler de Colmar et des localités limitrophes. Dictionnaire. Morphologie – phonétique – syntaxe*. Colmar: chez l'auteur.

Niedersächsisches Wörterbuch. Aufgrund der Vorarbeiten von Hans Janßen
      herausgegeben von Dieter Stellmacher. Neumünster: Wachholtz Verlag. 1958-.

Oppenrieder, Wilhelm (1990). Preposition Stranding im Deutschen? - Da will ich
      nichts von hören! In *Strukturen und Merkmale syntaktischer Kategorien*, ed.
      Gisbert Fanselow and Sascha W. Felix, 159-172. Tübingen: Gunter Narr Verlag.
      [*Studien zur deutschen Grammatik* 39]

Rheinisches Wörterbuch. Nach den Vorarbeiten von Josef Müller bearbeitet von
      Heinrich Dittmaier. Berlin: Erika Klopp Verlag. 1928-1971.

Riemsdijk, Henk van and Frans Zwarts (1974; 1997). Left Dislocation in Dutsch and
      Status of Copying Rules. In *Materials on Left Dislocation*, ed. Elena
      Anagnostopoulou, Henk van Riemsdijk and Frans Zwarts:13-29. Amsterdam:
      Benjamins.

Riemsdijk, Henk van (1975). A Case for a Trace: Preposition Stranding in Züritüütsch.
      In *Linguistics in the Netherlands 1972-1973*, ed. A. Kraak, 194-200. Assen,
      Amsterdam: Van Gorcum.

—— (1978). *A Case Study in Syntactic Markedness*. Lisse: The Peter de Ridder Press.

Saltveit, Laurits (1983). Syntax. In *Handbuch zur niederdeutschen Sprach- und
      Literaturwissenschaft*, ed. Gerhard Cordes and Dieter Möhn, 279-333. Berlin:
      Erich Schmidt Verlag.

Schlesisches Wörterbuch. Bearbeitet von Walther Mitzka. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter &
      Co. 1963-1965.

Schweizerisches Idiotikon. Wörterbuch der schweizerdeutschen Sprache. Begonnen von
      Friedrich Staub und Ludwig Tobler und fortgesetzt unter der Leitung von
      Albert Bachmann, Otto Gröger, Hans Wanner, Peter Dalcher und Peter Ott.
      Frauenfeld: Verlag Huber & Co. 1881-.

Sowinski, Bernhard (1997). *Lexikon deutschsprachiger Mundartautoren*. Hildesheim,
      Zürich, New York: Georg Olms Verlag.

Spangenberg, Karl (1993). *Laut- und Formeninventar thüringischer Dialekte. Beiband zum
      Thüringischen Wörterbuch*. Berlin: Akademie Verlag.

Steitz, Lothar (1981). *Grammatik der Saarbrücker Mundart*. Saarbrücken: Saarbrücker
      Druckerei und Verlag. [*Beiträge zur Sprache im Saarland* 2]

Thüringisches Wörterbuch. Auf Grund der von V. Michels begonnenen und H. Hucke
      fortgeführten Sammlungen bearbeitet unter der Leitung von K. Spangenberg.
      Berlin: Akademie Verlag. 1966-.

Trissler, Susanne (1993). P-Stranding im Deutschen. In *Extraktion im Deutschen I*, ed.
      F.-J. d'Avis, S. Beck, U. Lutz, J. Pafel, and S. Trissler, 247-291. Universität
      Stuttgart, Universität Tübingen. [*Arbeiten des Sonderforschungsbereichs 340* 34]

—— (1999). *Syntaktische Bedingungen für W-Merkmale: Zur Bildung interrogativer w-
      Phrasen im Deutschen*. Dissertation, Universität Tübingen.

Weise, Oskar (1909). Der gegenwärtige Stand der Forschung auf dem Gebiete der
      Syntax deutscher Mundarten. *Germanisch-Romanische Monatsschrift* 1:733-742.

Wichter, Sigurd (1980). Die Abfolge aus Nominalphrase und Satz als Einheit des
      gesprochenen Deutsch. *Zeitschrift für germanistische Linguistik* 8:34-50.

Wiesenhann, Tjabe (1936). *Einführung in das ostfriesische Niederdeutsch*. Weener.
      [Reprint 1977. Leer: Schuster Verlag.]

Wiesinger, Peter (1983). Die Einteilung der deutschen Dialekte. In *Dialektologie. Ein
      Handbuch zur deutschen und allgemeinen Dialektforschung*, ed. Werner Besch,
      Ulrich Knoop, Wolfgang Putschke, and Herbert Ernst Wiegand, 807-900. Berlin,
      New York: Walter de Gruyter. [*Handbücher zur Sprach- und
      Kommunikationswissenschaft* 1.2]

Wörterbuch der elsässischen Mundarten. Bearbeitet von Ernst Martin und Hans Lienhart. Strassburg: Verlag von Karl J. Trübner. 1899-1907.

Wossidlo, Richard (1895). Die Präpositionen und präpositionalen Adverbien in der Mecklenburger Mundart. *Jahrbuch des Vereins für niederdeutsche Sprachforschung* 20:40-56.

Zehetner, Ludwig (1985). *Das bairische Dialektbuch*. München: Verlag C.H.Beck.

Zribi-Hertz, Anne (1984). Orphan Prepositions in French and the Concept of 'Null Pronoun'. Bloomington, Indiana: Indiana University Linguistics Club.

Zwarts, Joost (1997a). Complex Prepositions and P-Stranding in Dutch. *Linguistics* 35:1091-1112.

—— (1997b). Lexical and Functional Properties of Prepositions. In *Grammatische Eigenschaften präpositionaler Elemente*, ed. Dagmar Haugmann and Stefan J. Schierholz, 1-18. Tübingen: Max Niemeyer Verlag. [*Linguistische Arbeiten* 371]