

Complex Motion Predicates in German - At the Interface of Auxiliary Selection and Nominal Structure

Modern German complex motion predicates (*reiten*, *fliegen* and *fahren*) offer an intriguing puzzle at the interface of nominal structure and auxiliary selection: **(i)** Is *Auto* (3) a DP or NP? **(ii)** Why is *Auto* restricted to *sein* (4)?

(1) Peter ist dieses Auto gefahren

Peter is this car driven

(2) Peter hat dieses Auto gefahren

Peter has this car driven

(3) Peter ist Auto gefahren

Peter is car driven

(4) *Peter hat Auto gefahren

Peter has car driven

(i) Previous accounts (Frey 2015) (Booij 2009): Since only plural and mass nouns can be bare arguments in German (Longobardi 2005) i.e. DPs, the nominal *Auto* is argued to be an NP licensed by *incorporation*. Topicalization (6) and negation (5) exhibit intervening material, rendering incorporation i.e. N-to-V head movement, unfeasible.

(5) Peter fliegt nicht Flugzeug

Peter flies not aeroplane

(6) Flugzeug ist Peter geflogen

Aeroplane is Peter flown

(i) New Proposal: Evidence suggests that *auto* is shifted to mass and thus has DP-status: cf. distribution of *viel* (7) and the *kein/keinen* alternation (9), (10) two phenomena restricted to mass nouns:

(7) Peter ist viel Auto gefahren

Peter is much car driven

(8) Peter hat viel *Apfel\Fleisch gegessen

Peter has much *apple\meat eaten

(9) Peter fährt doch gar kein/enPorsche

Peter drives but at all no Porsche

(10) Peter fliegt doch gar kein/enHubschrauber

Peter flies but at all no helicopter

- (11) Johannes isst doch gar kein*(en) Apfel
 Johannes eats but at all no tank
- (12) Silvie isst doch gar kein/en Fisch
 Silvie eats but at all no fish

(ii) **Auxiliary-distribution** is explained following Ramchand (2008): [InitiatorP[Initiator][Init'[Init°][ProcP[Undergoer][Proc'[Proc°][Path]]]]: *sein* co-occurs with an *initiator/undergoer-subject*; *haben* co-occurs with an *initiator-subject*. Since undergoer positions must be filled, object-DPs will yield *undergoer-readings* i.e. a mass denoting object yields a “cargo”-reading:

- (13) David hat Milch/ Auto nach Bayern gefahren
 David has milk/ car to Bavaria driven

The interpretation of *Auto* (3) results from insertion as a *path-argument*. Paths cannot be of category D with *haben* because *proc°* can assign case to but one DP, i.e. to the obligatory undergoer. In the *sein* paradigm *proc°* can assign case to path-arguments since the undergoer-DP moves to SpecInit receiving case from T°.

Booij, G. (2009): A Constructional Analysis of Quasi-Incorporation in Dutch. In Gengo Kenkyu (135), pp. 5–27. **Frey, Werner (2015):** NP-Incorporation in German. In Olga Borik, Berit Gehrke (Eds.): The syntax and semantics of pseudo-incorporation. Leiden, Boston: Brill (Syntax & Semantics, volume 40), pp. 225–261. **Longobardi, Giuseppe (2005):** Toward a Unified Grammar of Reference. In Zeitschrift für Sprachwissenschaft 24 (1). **Ramchand, Gillian (2008):** Verb meaning and the lexicon. A first-phase syntax. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press (Cambridge studies in linguistics, 116).