



5-2010

A Comparative Analysis of the Correct Usage of "nicht" and "kein" in Satznegation According to DaF Grammars

Kathleen Maureen Schuster
kschuste@utk.edu

Recommended Citation

Schuster, Kathleen Maureen, "A Comparative Analysis of the Correct Usage of "nicht" and "kein" in Satznegation According to DaF Grammars. " Master's Thesis, University of Tennessee, 2010.
http://trace.tennessee.edu/utk_gradthes/660

This Thesis is brought to you for free and open access by the Graduate School at Trace: Tennessee Research and Creative Exchange. It has been accepted for inclusion in Masters Theses by an authorized administrator of Trace: Tennessee Research and Creative Exchange. For more information, please contact trace@utk.edu.

To the Graduate Council:

I am submitting herewith a thesis written by Kathleen Maureen Schuster entitled "A Comparative Analysis of the Correct Usage of "nicht" and "kein" in Satznegation According to DaF Grammars." I have examined the final electronic copy of this thesis for form and content and recommend that it be accepted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Master of Arts, with a major in German.

Chauncey J. Mellor, Major Professor

We have read this thesis and recommend its acceptance:

Stefanie Ohnesorg, Daniel Magilow

Accepted for the Council:

Dixie L. Thompson

Vice Provost and Dean of the Graduate School

(Original signatures are on file with official student records.)

To the Graduate Council:

I am submitting herewith a thesis written by Kathleen M. Schuster entitled “A Comparative Analysis of the Correct Usage of *nicht* and *kein* in Satznegation According to DaF Grammars.” I have examined the final electronic copy of this thesis for form and content and recommend that it be accepted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Master of Arts, with a major in German.

Chauncey J. Mellor, Major Professor

We have read this thesis
and recommend its acceptance:

Stefanie Ohnesorg

Daniel Magilow

Accepted for the Council:

Carolyn R. Hodges, Vice Provost and
Dean of the Graduate School

A Comparative Analysis of the Correct Usage of *nicht* and *kein* in
Satznegation According to DaF Grammars

A Thesis Presented for
the Master of Arts
Degree
The University of Tennessee, Knoxville

Kathleen Schuster
May 2010

Copyright © 2010 by Kathleen Schuster
All rights reserved.

Acknowledgements

I am greatly indebted to my advisor, Dr. Jeff Mellor, not only for his helpful feedback, but most of all for his constant encouragement and positive attitude, without which I would not have been able to complete this thesis. Thanks also to my parents, Bill and Maureen Schuster, for their unwavering support. A special thank you to Dr. Hardarik Blühdorn of the Institut für deutsche Sprache for permission to use some of his unpublished research on German negation.

Abstract

The varying presentations of the rules for *nicht* and *kein* found in intermediate grammar books for students in North America and DaF-learners in Germany highlight the difficulty in finding sources that are both reliable and consistent as well as easily applicable. This thesis seeks to compare the explanations found in A.E. Hammer's *German Grammar and Usage* (revised by Martin Durrell), Helbig/Buscha's *Deutsche Grammatik*, and Hall/Scheiner's *Übungsgrammatik*, comparing all three to the basis of their information, *Duden: die Grammatik*. In order to assess how and where these sources converge and diverge, the analysis compares the intended use of each book, followed by the underlying concepts and terms, and then finally the rules for negation. The final two chapters attempt to answer two important questions that arise from comparing these sources. First, do beginner level textbooks prepare students with sufficient declarative grammar knowledge to understand and apply negation rules successfully? An analysis of *Kontakte*'s approach to teaching grammar, most specifically how to use *nicht* and *kein*, seeks to answer the first question. Secondly, could authors use a different approach for explaining this difficult grammar topic? Professor Hardarik Blühdorn's approach, as presented in his course *Negation: Syntax, Prosodie und Semantik* at the Universität Mannheim during the Fall semester of 2007, serves as an example of new research. His different approach might help non-native speakers of German learn how to use *nicht* and *kein* correctly. The analysis reaches three main conclusions. First of all, the rules differ primarily in the amount of detail used, as well as in the inconsistent use of common terminology across the sources. Secondly, beginner's level textbooks do not provide students with sufficient information about general grammar or negation to help them transition to using explanations found in intermediate grammar books. In order to understand the rules of *nicht* and *kein*, these students must first work through the background material methodically. Finally, intermediate learners could not rely on Professor Blühdorn's approach, as it focuses on the scope of *nicht*, not on the correct placement of *nicht* in order to negate an entire sentence. Appendix B provides a chart comparing the rules found in each source.

Table of Contents

Chapter 1 Introduction	1
Chapter 2 An Overview of the Grammar Sources	6
2.1 <i>German Grammar and Usage</i> by A.E. Hammer	7
2.2 <i>Übungsgrammatik: Deutsch als Fremdsprache für Fortgeschrittene</i> by Karin Hall and Barbara Scheiner	12
2.3 <i>Deutsche Grammatik: Ein Handbuch für den Ausländerunterricht</i> by Gerhard Helbig and Joachim Buscha.....	18
2.4 <i>Duden: die Grammatik</i>	24
Chapter 3 Terminology	30
3.1 Sentence Structure	30
3.2 <i>Das Prädikat</i>	34
3.3 <i>Das Funktionsverbgefüge</i>	39
3.4 <i>Valenz</i>	42
3.5 <i>Das Satzglied</i>	44
Chapter 4 Examples of the Correct Usage of <i>nicht</i> and <i>kein</i> Based on the Rules Prescribed.....	47
4.1 Usage of <i>kein</i>	47
4.1.1 Example One: Peter hat einen Bruder. (Helbig/Buscha Q1, #2, p.195).	47
4.1.2 Example Two: Die Mutter hat Kartoffeln eingekauft. (Helbig/Buscha Q1, #3, p. 195)..	48
4.1.3 Example Three: Er ist nicht/kein Anwalt. (Helbig/Buscha p.555).	48
4.1.4 Example Four: Es ist noch nicht/noch kein Sommer. (Helbig/Buscha p. 555).	50
4.1.5 Example Five: Der andere Reiseleiter kann anderen zuhören. (Hall/Scheiner, Übung 2, #3, p.306).	51
4.1.6 Example Six: Sie hatte Angst. (Helbig/Buscha p.554).	52
4.1.7 Example Seven: Tennis spielen.	52
4.2 The Correct Placement of <i>nicht</i>	55
4.2.1 Example Eight: Das Kind bedankte sich für die Schokolade. (Helbig/Buscha Q5, # 7, p.197).	56
4.2.2 Example Nine: Leipzig liegt an einem großen Fluss. (Helbig/Buscha Q6, #2, p.197).	60
4.2.3 Example Ten: Der Reiseleiter führte die Touristen wegen des schönen Wetters nicht durch das Museum. (Hall/Scheiner Übung 7, #7, p.310).....	62
4.2.4 Example Eleven: Der Reiseleiter war deshalb während dieser Zeit nicht dort. (Hall/Scheiner Übung 8, #2, p.311).	63
4.2.5 Example Twelve: Einige Touristen konnten ihre Reise dieses Mal aus den verschiedensten Gründen nicht gründlich vorbereiten.(Hall/Scheiner Übung 8, #12, p.311).	65
4.2.6 Example Thirteen: In unserer Jugend sind wir im Sommer nicht gern mit meinem Onkel im Wald spazierengegangen. (Durrell, Ex. 19, #12, p.190).	67

4.2.7 Example Fourteen: Er will nicht mit uns Kaffee trinken. (Hall/Scheiner Übung 2, #11, p.306).	67
4.2.8 Example Fifteen: Der Reiseleiter geht morgens bestimmt nicht sehr früh aus dem Haus. (Hall/Scheiner Übung 8, #4, p.311).	68
Chapter 5 The Transition from a Beginner's Level Textbook to an Intermediate Grammar: An Analysis of <i>Kontakte</i>	71
Chapter 6 A Different Approach to Explaining Negation: An Overview of the Materials Presented by Professor Hardarik Blühdorn in His Vorlesung <i>Negation: Syntax, Prosodie und Semantik</i> at the Universität Mannheim during the Fall Semester of 2009	Error!
Bookmark not defined.	87
Chapter 7 Conclusion.....	100
List of References	105
Appendix	108
Appendix A.....	109
Appendix B.....	109
Vita.....	135

The simplicity of negating a positive statement correctly in a second language does not seem at first to extend far beyond using the equivalent of *no*. For native English speakers learning German as a foreign or second language, the semantic concept behind negation does not immediately appear to pose a great problem, as both languages allow for creating negative utterances through the use of words containing a negative meaning (*forbid; verbieten*); through the use of prefixes (*un-, dis-; un, des-*); through the use of logic (*Some of the children like to read.; Manche Kinder lesen gern.*); through the use of pragmatics (*I heard you the first time.; Ich hab' dich doch schon gehört*); and finally, through the use of intonation (*Gelesen habe ich das Buch. I did read the book, after all.*). Despite these similarities, mastering the rules of syntax for *nicht* and *kein* does in fact pose a significant problem at all levels of the acquisition of German for English-speaking learners.

Beginning in the first semester, students typically learn two basic rules of the following sort. First, *nicht* precedes the part of speech that it should negate. For example, *Ich bin glücklich. Ich bin **nicht** glücklich*. Secondly, if a noun following an indefinite article or a plural noun is negated, the word *kein* must act as the negator. For example, *Ich habe ein Buch. Ich habe **kein** Buch; Ich habe Pflanzen. Ich habe **keine** Pflanzen*.

But reliance on just these rules can lead to confusion when they fail to address even slightly more complicated cases. A simple sentence, such as *Ich sehe das* does not become *Ich sehe nicht das*, but rather, *Ich sehe das nicht*. Should the sentence *Ich lese gern Bücher* change to *Ich lese nicht gern Bücher* or *Ich lese gern keine Bücher*? Sentences more complicated than those, such as *Ich gehe morgen zur Uni*, also raise similar questions. Is it *Ich gehe nicht morgen zur Uni* or *Ich gehe morgen nicht zur Uni*? Over time,

exposure to the L2 can of course help accustom learners to the correct placement of *nicht*, as can in-depth grammar explanations written for non-native speakers, but it is the object of this thesis to trace the formal presentation of negation in some widely used higher level grammars, analyze their similarities and differences, and lastly to explore if, how, and how well a commonly used elementary American textbook prepares learners to make effective use of these higher level grammars.

Regardless of learners' language levels, applying the rules of negation becomes more difficult as increasingly subtle distinctions in the utterances to be negated emerge. Investigating these complexities is the subject of this thesis. Though grammar books for learners of German as a foreign language provide detailed explanations meant to aid students in their comprehension and production of the L2, the number of rules for using *nicht* and *kein* varies substantially by author. Some books provide an entire chapter on the subject, while others provide few rules beyond what students have been given at the beginner's level. The guidelines do overlap to a large extent, but the authors' intended audiences influence the degree of detail, or rather, the number of rules given, in each book. Varying definitions of sentence elements and syntactical approaches on which each author bases his or her work also dictate the formulation of the rules for negation. From these differences, the following questions arise: Where do the explanations converge and diverge? How adequately does each explanation provide the needed information for a non-native speaker to negate correctly? Does one source encompass the complexity of all of the rules or does each provide additional information not found in another source? In order to answer these questions, several grammar books will serve to represent the scope of material available to students in North America and Germany learning German as a foreign language.

First of all, an overview of a German grammar book for native English speakers will represent the most common materials available in North America. The survey will include Hammer's *German Grammar and Usage*. As a representative of a principal source used by DaF learners from varying language backgrounds in the German context, Hall/Scheiner's *Übungsgrammatik: Deutsch als Fremdsprache für Fortgeschrittene* will be analyzed. Helbig/Buscha's *Deutsche Grammatik: Ein Handbuch für Ausländerunterricht*¹ will also represent a principal source used by DaF learners, though contrasting with Hall/Scheiner in its comprehensiveness. As shown by their sales ranking, these books enjoy approximately equal status. Finally, the current edition of the *Duden Grammatik* will act as the main comparison for all grammar explanations due to its prominence in the study of the German language for both native and non-native speakers. As each author formulates his or her explanation for the use of "nicht" and "kein" with the terminology found within the same work, a comparative analysis of these terms will precede the main analysis of the rules of negation. Determining the degree of commonality between the basic terminologies should aid in identifying the points of divergence in the main analysis.

The analysis of the rules given by each author will follow the overview of each grammar. The main points of comparison will discuss the rules for using *nicht*, the rules for using *kein*, and the rules for cases where either *nicht* or *kein* occur. Several examples, including both simple and complicated sentences that could cause confusion, will underlie each description in order to maintain a clear comparison throughout the analysis.

¹ The sales ranking for German grammars in Germany is not surprisingly much higher than for German grammars in the US. A check of sales rankings in mid-Fall 2009 showed similar sales rankings for Hall/Scheiner (6,582) and Helbig/Buscha (6,269), although these numbers appear subject to marked seasonal variation and will be higher near the beginning of the semester.

In order to structure the discussion of the several topics of this thesis—the consistency and comprehensiveness of presentation of negation in German grammars for advanced learners and the degree to which beginning grammars prepare learners to make use of the presentations for advanced learners—I will first analyze the presentation of negation in the widely-used beginner-level textbook *Kontakte*. Looking at the general presentation of grammar rules, in addition to those specifically referring to *nicht* and *kein*, will aid in determining the degree to which the authors have facilitated or impeded the understanding of grammar explanations at a more advanced level. If the rules provided do not clash with those found in the other sources analyzed within this thesis, perhaps the differences between the books will not have as strong an influence on a student’s ability to produce negated utterances correctly.

The second discussion will analyze an approach to understanding German negation from the perspectives of syntax, semantics, and prosody and will also complete the analysis of this thesis. This idea, around which Professor Hardarick Blühdorn based a lecture at the University of Mannheim during the fall semester of 2007, has a different starting point than the other grammars. In order to understand word order, he contends that any syntactical analysis must begin by rearranging utterances into a Verb-letzt pattern to reflect the true syntax of the German language. Though this thesis cannot include an analysis of every detail of Professor Blühdorn’s approach, his overall approach to understanding negation could enrich the current material available to DaF students.

The reader should note that I have consciously chosen not to devote extensive attention to the topics of prosody with regard to negation. The inclusion of prosody into the analysis goes beyond the scope of this study. Moreover the books examined in this study do not address this topic in sufficient detail to support firm conclusions. It is further important to note that the grammar books chosen for analysis here frequently serve as reference works for learners from elementary to advanced levels. They do not confine their

explanations according to stages of the learner's proficiency, but rather systematically organize their presentation according to topics of interest and value to the learner

An Overview of the Grammar Sources

After completing the beginner's level of German as a foreign language over the course of several semesters at a secondary school or university, students must often begin using a grammar book for an intermediate or advanced language course. In contrast to previous grammar instruction, these materials do not present grammar points based solely on their communicative function at rudimentary proficiency levels. Authors choose instead to structure their presentation according to grammatical topic and to provide rules for using each part of speech. The exercises then drill the learner on the material covered in each chapter.

This organizational principle has important consequences complicating the presentation of negation. Because negation of a sentence involves more than one part of speech simultaneously or more than one part of speech joined in a syntactical framework, the discussion of negation can be fragmented in several different ways, e.g. negation of verbal predicates, negation of adverbs, negation of nouns, negation of the entire statement, negation of one particular aspect of a statement, and so forth.

Adding to this complexity is the interaction between syntactical construction and intonational patterns, which many presentations ignore altogether, in part because there is not yet an agreed comprehensive approach to this matter.² These are among

² The observations made by William Moulton (*The Sounds of English and German*, Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1962) still hold to a great extent today. "Not a great deal is known as yet about the intonation of English and German..." (129). Regional differences add to the complexity of this topic and no doubt contribute to the lack of a comprehensive approach: "Until far more is known than at present about the intonations of English and German, it will not be possible to make a contrastive analysis of the two systems and to reveal the points of conflict between them. ... What are the features in the intonation of a

the reasons intonation will not be addressed here. The following section aims to provide a complete overview of the type of grammar presentation and a summary of how the authors address negation specifically in each of the analyzed sources.

2.1 German Grammar and Usage by A.E. Hammer

The second edition of A.E. Hammer's *German Grammar and Usage* features the revision of a successful, comprehensive grammar published in 1971 with additional explanations added by Martin Durrell in 1991. The original work sought to provide learners who had advanced beyond the beginning level with a prescriptive guide to German usage, all of which Hammer based on a descriptive approach to gathering materials. He not only used *Der große Duden: Vol.4 Grammatik* (1966), but also called on the expertise of native speakers as his two main sources for rules and examples that would reflect "current German usage" (iv). The remaining references included other well-known German grammars meant for the native-English speaking student. Durrell's second edition built upon this foundation with a similar idea in mind.³

Twenty years later, Martin Durrell provided an updated edition that would reflect new teaching methods and the needs of the student to communicate beyond written language. Again relying heavily on the latest Duden grammar, Durrell checked the accuracy of the examples provided by Hammer, of which he retained a large portion. He also used the corpus of the INSTITUT FÜR DEUTSCHE

southerner (e.g., from Bavaria or Austria) which make him sound *schlampig* to a northerner (e.g., from Berlin)? What are the features in the intonation of a northerner which make him sound aggressive and "Prussian" to a southerner?" (137)

³Hammer, A.E., Hammer's German Grammar and Usage, 1971, ed. Martin Durrell, 2nd ed. (New York: Edward Arnold, 1991) iii-v.

SPRACHE, documenting both modern spoken and written German in order to supplement existing material. The new explanations ranged from a more in-depth discussion of how learners can adjust to the various social registers and important regional variants⁴, to more detailed explanations of grammar terminology, recognizing that “it can no longer be taken for granted that they will be fully familiar with grammar terminology and notions” (v). We shall see how this latter point affects the utility of the other grammars in this study.

The explanations found in Hammer’s second edition begin with declinable parts of speech, moving briefly to adverbs, numerals, modal particles, and expressions of time, before devoting a large section to verbs. With the exception of two chapters on conjunctions and prepositions, respectively, the remainder of the book focuses on word order, word formation, and spelling and punctuation. The main sources referenced appear generally in two places: at the beginning of each chapter after the general introduction and in the bibliography. Many explanations extend beyond a simple rule or a detailed description of the function of the part of speech to a lengthier comparison of English and German rules and usage. For example, under 13.2.6 “Other uses of the infinitive with *zu*,” in Chapter Thirteen, “The infinitive and the participles,” the reader finds three additional rules. First, “in comparative phrases,” for example, *Du kannst nichts Besseres tun, als zu Hause (zu) bleiben*. Secondly, “in exclamations, as in English,” *Und zu denken, daß es ihr nichts bedeutet hat! And to think it didn’t (sic) anything to her!* Finally, “in small ads,” *Zwei-Zimmer-Wohnung ab 1.Mai zu vermieten. Two-room-flat to let from May 1st (257)*.

⁴Hammer, v-vi.

By contrasting the similarities and dissimilarities between the English and the target language German, the authors encourage a reliance on comparison as a means to understanding German grammar. This approach suggests that instances of close parallelism need less of a comparison, therefore, less of an explanation.⁵ This logic could also explain Hammer's lack of rules and explanations for negation: the use of *nicht* and *kein* appears within the context of other parts of speech instead of in a chapter devoted solely to negation.

The chapters "Other determiners and pronouns" and "Word Order" feature nearly four pages of in-depth discussions on the correct usage and placement of *nicht*. Durrell's revision features more contemporary terms drawn from German sources, such as

⁵ In this regard, it is worth noting that the notion of positive and negative transference, where the behavior in the native language and target language are parallel or disjoint respectively, was articulated some time ago by Robert L. Politzer, *Teaching German: A Linguistic Orientation*, (Waltham MA: Blaisdell, 1968) as follows: "The child who forms the past tense as **singed* or **thinked* is transferring ... but **transferring incorrectly**. Incorrect transfers or, as we shall call them, **negative transfers**, caused by exceptions ... are committed quite often by the learner of a foreign language. But, as we have stated before, the learner of a second language must combat not only the "inconsistencies" of the foreign language system; he is also influenced by the transfer pattern of his own native language. If these patterns of transfer—these "manufacturing processes" of the native language—correspond with those of the foreign language, they are likely to promote **positive transfer** ... if they clash, they will lead to the transfer of incorrect patterns, that is, **negative transfer**. (22) Thus, advanced grammars targeted at a specific learner group, e.g. English speakers, might be expected to address a different set of topics or stress the same topics in a different manner than grammars intended for an audience with a highly diverse set of native language experience. This logic could induce differences in approach to negation in grammars of these two types. An in-depth study of this interesting question is beyond the scope of this thesis.

SATZKLAMMER and *VALENZ*. Highlighting his careful and extensive use of German sources, he generally provides an English equivalent for the German term, for example, *COMPLEMENT* for *ERGÄNZUNG*.⁶ He also alternates between synonyms to describe the overall clause structure in terms of the *SATZKLAMMER: INITIAL POSITION* for *VORFELD*; *BRACKET*¹ for *LINKE SATZKLAMMER*; *OTHER ELEMENTS* for *MITTELFELD*; *BRACKET*² for *RECHTE SATZKLAMMER*.⁷ These terms, though occasionally appearing in other chapters, generally are confined to the chapter on word order. To describe the scope of *nicht*, Durrell differentiates between, “[negating] the content of a clause as a whole,” and “[applying] to one particular element,” and somewhat uncharacteristically avoids using the German technical terms *SATZ- UND SONDERNEGATION*.

To negate an entire clause correctly, the reader must follow three rules. First, *nicht* “precedes adverbs of manner and all verb complements.”⁸ For example, *Sie haben gestern nicht gut gespielt. Sie sind gestern nicht nach Aalen gefahren.* Secondly, *nicht* “follows all objects and adverbials.” For example, *Er hat mir das Buch nicht gegeben. Den Turm sieht man von hier aus nicht.*

⁶Hammer 348.

⁷ Hammer 455.

⁸ “The elements which are required by a verb in order to construct a complete sentence are called its complements. In German, these are known as *Ergänzungen*” (348). According to Hammer, they include the subject, accusative, dative, genitive, and prepositional objects, in addition to place, direction, and predicate complements. (348-349)

Finally, “if *nicht* applies to [only] one element in the clause...then it precedes that element.” For example, *Sie hat mir nicht das Buch gegeben* (i.e. not the book, but something else) (478-9). 17

The rules for using *kein* vs. *nicht* encompass nine conditions for the reader to consider, beginning with the most general rule: “*kein* is the negative form of the indefinite article.” *Kennst du (k)einen Arzt?* The remaining rules distinguish between cases in which only *kein* can negate, such as with certain phrasal verbs, *Er hat sich keine Mühe gegeben*. However “if the noun is felt to be the equivalent of a separable prefix, as it is so closely connected with the verb,” then *nicht* appears: *Er spielt nicht Klavier*. In some cases, which are not exhaustively listed but only exemplified by relatively few representative citations, *nicht* and *kein* can negate interchangeably, *Er spricht kein/nicht Deutsch* (108); *Er ist/wird kein/nicht Lehrer*. Hammer cites several other uses of *kein* that in his parlance function idiomatically, *Sie ist noch keine zehn Jahre alt* (109), or as a pronoun, *Keiner im Dorf wollte was sagen* (110). By contrast, *nicht ein* serves to emphasize the singularity of *ein*, *Nicht ein Junge wußte die Antwort*.⁹ Hammer also mentions the tendency of *nicht ein* to appear more commonly following *wenn ... nicht* used to express English “except for the fact.” For example, *Man hätte ihn kaum bemerkt, wenn ihm nicht ein Schnurrbart etwas Distinguiertes verliehen hätte* (109).¹⁰ The remaining instances where a negated indefinite article appears in a clause can use either *kein* or *nicht*.

⁹ Helbig/Buscha categorizes this as a *ZAHLADJEKTIV*.

¹⁰ Due to the gratuitous typos found in this example, I tacitly correct the sentence in the text to its obviously intended form. The original sentence: “Man hätte ihn kihm (sic) bemerkt, wenn khm (sic) nicht ein Schnurrbart etwas Distinguiertes verliehen hätte“ (109).

To sum up, Hammer and Durrell focus their efforts on matters where English and German diverge. They make substantial efforts to reflect accurately a wide range of German usage and take pains to familiarize their readers with English and German grammatical terminology, recognizing that this knowledge cannot readily be assumed. In describing various cases of negation, they provide general rules for the use of *nicht* vs. *kein* respectively, but follow these rules with a series of specific instances where the one or the other form is customary. While acknowledging that certain utterances, e.g. *Er ist Lehrer*, can be negated in either of two ways, they list only relatively few examples and do not attempt a systematic explanation of distinguishing these utterances from others, e.g. *Er spielt Klavier*, which appear identical on the surface, but regularly favor only one manner of negation.

2.2 Übungsgrammatik: Deutsch als Fremdsprache für Fortgeschrittene by Karin Hall and Barbara Scheiner

Karin Hall and Barbara Scheiner's *Übungsgrammatik: Deutsch als Fremdsprache für Fortgeschrittene* explains neither the method used for collecting the materials, nor the grammar references from which they derived their rules. The intended audience includes all non-native speakers of German who have reached an intermediate or advanced level, in particular those preparing for a university entrance examination in the German language. The book could also serve as a "studienbegleitendes Lehrwerk" (3) as part of a language course or for independent study. This book presents rules, and as such presents a prescriptive approach to learning grammar, though it illustrates the rules descriptively by providing examples taken from texts not intended for pedagogical use. Many example sentences come directly from written sources that belong to more formal genres, such as newspapers, academic journals, and novels, while some do not include a citation. None of the sources appears to include spoken language.

The exercises build upon each other within specific contexts that generally require the reader to understand meaning in order¹⁹ to complete them successfully. Some exercises, such as dehydrated sentences, do not demand that the student read each sentence closely, although many attempt to demand that the student connect form and meaning to produce a correct response. For example, in chapter twenty “Zeitstufen—Zeitformen,” exercise seven consists of an excerpt from *Psychologie heute* (3/1990). The student must conjugate the infinitives in brackets in the correct tense according to their meaning within the article.

Die nächsten zehn Jahre werden die Jahre der größten Herausforderungen sein, die die Wirtschaft bis heute (erleben). Europa, das bald der größte Markt der Welt (sein), sowie die USA und die zu Wohlstand gekommenen asiatischen Länder (sich schlagen) in den nächsten Jahren bei der Erschließung ausländischer Märkte. Zukünftig (ausgehen) die Führungsimpulse zu einem großen Teil von Frauen. (325)

The chapter layout reflects the intended use of the book: the authors address the most common problems for advanced learners who require more advanced knowledge of the formal written language. Unlike the other comprehensive grammars, the topics found in this source focus on several topics that will aid the learners in developing their writing or in understanding different written genres. These are: verbs; clauses that replace other grammar structures; adverbial and modal elements; and word order. Declension and conjugation rules and various charts follow the answer key at the end of the book.¹¹ Because non-native speakers from a range of language backgrounds should be able to use this grammar, the explanations cannot use a specific other language for comparison, as

¹¹ Hall, Karin, and Barbara Scheiner, Übungsgrammatik: Deutsch als Fremdsprache für Fortgeschrittene. (Ismaning: Max Hueber Verlag, 2001) 403-422.

Hammer does with English. The authors explain some concepts in great detail (see Konjunktiv II), while assuming with others that 20 the student has a basic understanding of grammar concepts, such as *TRENNBARE UND UNTRENNBARE VERBEN* (38-9). Terms unique to current German grammars, such as *FUNKTIONSVERBGEFÜGE* and *SATZKLAMMER* also appear with definitions. The presentation of clause structure parallels that of Duden, which is not specifically referenced, and appears under a variety of terms. The authors use the following terms synonymously: *VORFELD* or *1.POSITION* (287); *PRÄDIKAT 1* (294); *MITTELFELD* which includes the *PRÄDIKAT 1* and *WEITERE POSITIONEN* (287); *PRÄDIKAT 2* (294); and *NACHFELD* or *LETZTE POSITION*. The charts “Die Verteilung der Satzglieder auf Vor-, Mittel- und Nachfeld” (287) and “Die Stellung der nominalen und pronominalen Satzglieder” (294-5) contradict the definition of *SATZKLAMMER*, as neither chart clearly separates the *VOR-* and *NACHFELD* from the *MITTELFELD* with the *PRÄDIKATSTEILE*, but rather includes the *LINKE SATZKLAMMER* as part of the *MITTELFELD*, and the *RECHTE SATZKLAMMER* as part of the *NACHFELD*. Despite this inconsistency, the overall concept reflects the main idea of the *SATZFELDTHEORIE*¹².

¹² The Satzfeldtheorie defines sentence structure, or rather, clause structure, based on the placement of the finite verb. The basic outline contains a Vorfeld, linke Satzklammer, Mittelfeld, rechte Satzklammer, and Nachfeld. The following chart provides examples for a (a) V1-Satz, (b) V2-Satz, (c) V-letzt Satz.

Type	Vorfeld	linke Satzklammer	Mittelfeld	rechte Satzklammer	Nachfeld
a	∅	Hast	du es	gesehen	bevor ich es gesehen habe?

Of the twenty chapters, one chapter, consisting of twelve pages, is devoted entirely to negation. The subchapters include „Satznegation,“ „Teilnegation,“ „Negation von Adverbialen, Angaben und Ergänzungen,“ „Negationswörter außer *nicht*,“ „Weitere Negationsmöglichkeiten,“ and „Die doppelte Negation als Bejahung“ (6). The basic principles outlined in this grammar include, most importantly, an understanding of the *NEGATIONSKLAMMER* (305)¹³ and *SATZNEGATION* in contrast to *SONDERNEGATION*. For example, *Die Touristen sind wegen des Rockfestivals nicht nach Paris gefahren.* (=Satznegation) *Die Touristen sind nicht wegen des Rockfestivals nach Paris gefahren* (=Teilnegation) (304). A list of word order rules also appears, especially with adverbials, though defining them in terms of *KAUSAL*, *TEMPORAL*, *MODAL*, and *LOKAL*. Generally, *nicht* follows *KAUSALANGABEN*, *Die Bootsfahrt auf der Seine fand wegen des Regens nicht statt.*; *TEMPORALANGABEN*, *Einige Touristen schliefen in der Nacht/die*

b	Du	hast	es	gesehen	bevor ich es gesehen habe?
c	∅	ob/dass/wenn,etc	du es	gesehen hast	bevor ich es gesehen habe...

Wöllstein-Leisten, Angelika, Axel Heilmann, Peter Stepan, and Sten Vikner, Deutsche Satzstruktur: Grundlagen der syntaktischen Analyse, Bibliografische Information der Deutschen Nationalbibliothek 3 (Tübingen: Stauffenberg Verlag Brigitte Narr GmbH, 1997) 53-55.

¹³ According to Hall and Scheiner, “Bei der Satznegation wird das Prädikat negiert und damit zugleich der ganze Satz. Das Negationswort *nicht* tendiert zum Satzende und bildet mit dem finiten Verb eine sogenannte ‘Negationsklammer’, die die anderen Satzglieder einschließt ” (305).

*ganze Nacht/gestern nicht*¹⁴; and MODALWÖRTER, *Eine Verlängerung der Reise klappte leider nicht*. Elements generally preceded by *nicht* include TEMPORALADVERBIEN, *Andere schliefen nicht sofort ein.*; LOKALANGABEN MIT PRÄPOSITION, *Der Reiseleiter holte die Touristen nicht am Flughafen ab.*; MODALANGABEN MIT PRÄPOSITION BZW. ALS ADJEKTIVE ODER ALS ADVERB, *Die Touristen verlassen Paris nicht ohne Bedauern/nicht gern.*; and ADVERBIALE ERGÄNZUNGEN, *Der Reiseleiter stammt nicht aus Paris.* (309-10)

The definition of the role of *kein*, similar to that of other grammar sources, follows two basic rules. First, *kein* “negiert Substantive mit unbestimmtem Artikel,” *Es steht keine Überraschung bevor*. Secondly, *kein* „negiert Substantive...ohne Artikel sowie artikellose Substantive mit dem Pronomen *andere*,” *Der Reiseleiter gibt sich keine Mühe; Er kennt keine anderen Länder* (306). Hall/Scheiner also includes the differences between *noch nicht* vs. *noch kein*, *nicht mehr* vs. *kein mehr*, and *nicht einmal* (312). Furthermore, negation extends into an understanding of verbs with an inherently negating meaning, such as *untersagen* (314), as well as double-negation as a means of *Bejahung*. We shall see that Helbig/Buscha’s grammar outlines the correct usage of *nicht* and *kein* in greater detail.

In sum, Hall/Scheiner focus on learners from evidently diverse language backgrounds preparing for university entrance examinations in German, stress a variety of formal written genres, and do not explicitly reference the spoken language. The book

¹⁴ Hall/Scheiner categorizes *gestern* as belonging to a group of TEMPORALADVERBIEN followed by *nicht*, as opposed to a TEMPORALADVERB like *immer*, which *nicht* must precede. (309) Though Helbig/Buscha defines these categories as *unabhängig* or *abhängig*, respectively, from the speaker’s point of view (552), Hall/Scheiner does not explain the difference between the two categories.

contains numerous exercises for independent student learning and includes an answer key. Many exercises require understanding of²³ a written context to successfully complete the tasks provided. The grammatical terminology used tacitly incorporates the terminology of the Duden grammar and, with respect to sentence syntax, adopts major features of *Satzfeldtheorie*. The presentation of negation is set forth in one entire chapter consisting of several subchapters. Nevertheless, the rules for choosing *nicht* vs. *kein*, while substantial, fail to address certain matters in detail.

2.3 Deutsche Grammatik: Ein Handbuch für den Ausländerunterricht by Gerhard Helbig and Joachim Buscha

Gerhard Helbig and Joachim Buscha's *Deutsche Grammatik: Ein Handbuch für Ausländerunterricht*, like Hammer and Durrell's grammar, emerged in 2001 as a revision of an earlier work, which was originally titled *Deutsche Übungsgrammatik* (1977) and published in the German Democratic Republic and then later retitled *Übungsgrammatik Deutsch* (1991, 1998).¹⁵ The intended audience includes all non-native speakers of German enrolled in a language course or studying independently at an intermediate or advanced level.¹⁶ At the time of the book's first publication, native speakers of Slavic and other Eastern European languages comprised a larger portion of the audience due to the political situation of the GDR. The authors present a comprehensive, prescriptive grammar that exceeds those previously mentioned in complexity, possibly due to the language background of their first readership. In contrast to the grammars intended for native English speakers, the explanations alternate between assuming readers have a basic




¹⁵ Helbig, Gerhard, and Helbig Buscha, *Deutsche Grammatik: Ein Handbuch für den Ausländerunterricht*, (Berlin: Langenscheidt KG, 2001) 634.

¹⁶ Helbig and Buscha 17.

understanding of grammar terminology and assuming they will require more information. Though this also occurs in Hall/Scheiner,²⁴ Helbig/Buscha provides more information about the morphological, syntactical, and semantic characteristics of the parts of speech for the non-native speaker in an attempt to reveal “die Dialektik zwischen Struktur und Funktion als auch die Dialektik zwischen Sprachsystem und Sprachverwendung” (17). For example, the first chapter on verbs begins by providing a simple definition to set them apart from other parts of speech as “die einzige Wortklasse, deren Elemente konjugiert werden können, d.h. in Person, Numerus, Tempus, Genus und Modus...verändert werden können” (23). In order for readers to understand the conjugation charts that follow the initial definition, they must already understand the terms *INDIKATIV*, *PRÄSENS*, etc. or must find the additional explanations later in the chapter whose definitions range from a paragraph to several pages. The amount of detail forms such a stark contrast to the previously mentioned sources that its overall usefulness likely exceeds that of Hall/Scheiner for non-native speakers from all language backgrounds.

The bibliography contains a wide variety of sources, however, the authors characterize their work as a “Resultatsgrammatik” (17) in which they intend to present their own method of understanding grammar. As in other German grammars, these authors utilize Duden for a portion of their foundation, as well as *DEPENDENZGRAMMATIK* and the *SATZFELDTHEORIE*, but combine them into a presentation that differs greatly from that of other sources. The terms *OBLIGATORISCHE* and *FAKULTATIVE AKTANTEN* appear regularly throughout the chapters, receiving special attention in Chapter 13 “Satzmodelle”. The *SATZFELDTHEORIE* does not appear in the same manner as in Hall/Scheiner or Hammer. Those authors use terminology derived from other sources and their own scholarly work in order to simplify the concept for readers whose purpose is to understand German grammar as a means to

communicate by increasing their passive and active knowledge of German through explicit grammar explanations and corresponding exercises. Helbig/Buscha hints at these concepts in Chapter 11 “Satzgliedstellung” with the terms *ERST-*, *ZWEIT-*, and *LETZTSTELLUNG* (473) for the finite verb, as well as with the term *VERBALER RAHMEN* (475), which corresponds with *SATZKLAMMER*. The stem *RAHMEN* thus replaces *KLAMMER: RAHMENBILDUNG AND AUSRAHMUNG* (476). But, instead of illustrating the clause structure by dividing examples into different fields, the authors present a non-linear, hierarchical model that raises the *PRÄDIKAT* and *PRÄDIKATSTEILE* above other elements to illustrate the *ABHÄNGIGKEITSSTRUKTUR* (448). The following examples feature (1) *SUBJEKT-VERB-OBJEKT* sentence, (2) *SUBJEKT-VERB-OBJEKT-PARTIZIP II*, (3) *SUBJEKT-VERB-LEXIKALISCHER PRÄDIKATSTEIL*.



Negation receives its own chapter comprised of fourteen pages, which also begins with a detailed explanation of the many facets of negation extending far beyond the word *nicht*. Instead of memorizing rules, the reader has a list of fifteen *REGULARITÄTEN* for *SATZNEGATION*. (Please see Appendix B) Additional notes regarding *SONDERNEGATION* follow the basic explanations as

well. In contrast to the other grammars, Helbig/Buscha reduces understanding word order to understanding the relationship between the finite verb and the other elements in the sentence, except the subject. Their reason: “das Negationswort *nicht*...strebt nach dem Ende des Satzes und bildet zusammen mit dem finiten Verb eine Negationsklammer,” *Er besuchte seinen alten Freund trotz der engen Bindungen nicht* (549). The only elements that could follow *nicht* must also form a *KLAMMER* with the finite verb. Such elements include (4) *PRÄDIKATIVE*, (5) *OBJEKTSPRÄDIKATIVE*, (6) *LEXIKALISCHE PRÄDIKATSTEILE*, (7) *NOMINALE TEILE VON FUNKTIONSVORBEGEFÜGEN*, and (8) *OBLIGATORISCHE UND* (9) *FAKULTATIVE AKTANTEN*, (549-550) in addition to separable prefixes and infinitives.

- | | |
|---|---|
| (4) Er wird nicht Rechtsanwalt. | (5) Sie nennt ihn nicht fleißig. |
| (6) Sie fährt nicht <i>Auto</i> . | (7) Sie nahm nicht <i>Rücksicht auf ihre Kinder</i> . |
| (8) Er legt das Buch nicht <i>auf den Tisch</i> . | (9) Die Konferenz dauerte nicht <i>den ganzen Tag</i> . |

The word order for *nicht* also depends upon the type of adverbial within the clause. Should the adverbial be a (10) *FREIE LOKALE ANGABE*, *nicht* can precede or follow it regardless of its form. For (11) *FREIE KAUSALANGABE* or a (12) *FREIE TEMPORALANGABE*, *nicht* can precede or follow it depending on its form, but must precede (13) *FREIE MODALANGABE* regardless of its form.¹⁷ *Nicht* can precede these adverbials to form *SONDERNEGATION*. If the adverbial consists of an adverb or a *MODALWORT* (551-2), *nicht* must follow it.

- (10) Ich traf ihn im Café (dort) *nicht*. –Ich traf ihn *nicht* im Café (dort).

¹⁷ There is a sense, though none of these authors verbalizes it explicitly, that a *Modalangabe* shows very striking similarities to other items in the *rechte Satzklammer* or *verbaler Rahmen*, given its positional behavior that is parallel to these items.

(11) Er erschien wegen des Essens *nicht*. (Satznegation)

Er erschien *nicht* wegen des Essens (Sondernegation oder Satznegation) .

Er erschien deshalb *nicht*. (Satznegation) *Er erschien *nicht* deshalb.¹⁸

(12) Er besucht mich am Abend *nicht*. (Satznegation)

Er besucht mich *nicht* am Abend. (Sonder- oder Satznegation)

Der Autobus fährt zwei Tage *nicht*. (Satznegation) *Der Autobus fährt *nicht* zwei Tage.

(13) Er las *nicht* mit guter Aussprache. *Er las mit guter Aussprache *nicht*.

Er las *nicht* richtig. *Er las richtig *nicht*.¹⁹

The use of *kein* includes the negation of a noun with an indefinite article or a *NULLARTIKEL*. (See Appendix B, examples 9a through 14a) The remaining explanations outline more precise conditions not outlined in the same manner by the other grammars. For example, Helbig/Buscha lists different types of nouns whose meanings are so tightly intertwined with that of the verbs that they no longer function as a noun object. In these cases, a related adjective or verb can often replace this combination. For example, *Er holte Atem* (= *atmete*) or *Er hatte Hunger* (= *war hungrig*) (554). If a verb cannot replace the noun, then only *nicht* can negate the accusative noun. For example, *Er kann **nicht** Auto fahren*. In contrast to Hammer's explanation, Helbig/Buscha acknowledge the sentence intonation's capacity to allow for *SATZ-* to *SONDERNEGATION* and for *nicht* to remain in the *MITTELFELD* while

¹⁸ *Er erschien nicht deshalb* reflects only *SONDERNEGATION*. The same applies to example (12) *Der Autobus fährt nicht zwei Tage*. Compare with example (11).

¹⁹ „In Sätzen mit einer Modalbestimmung kann nur diese, nicht aber die gesamte Prädikation negiert werden“ (Helbig/Buscha, 552).

negating an element in the *VORFELD*. For example, *Alle Studenten waren nicht verheiratet. (Satznegation: Von 100% wird behauptet, dass sie nicht verheiratet waren.)* vs. *Alle Studenten waren nicht verheiratet* (548).²⁰

28

To sum up, the Helbig-Buscha grammar addresses an audience of advanced learners of diverse language backgrounds, possibly with a greater proportional representation of speakers from Eastern Europe. It provides a markedly more detailed presentation of negation than the other grammars surveyed, relying more heavily on more differentiated terminology, e.g. *FREIE MODALANGABE* vs. *MODALWORT* or *PRÄDIKATIVE* vs. *OBJEKTSPRÄDIKATIVE*, instances of which are rather exhaustively listed following their respective definitions. In somewhat greater detail than the other grammars, Helbig-Buscha addresses the distinction between nouns negatable by *kein* and nouns so closely interlinked with specific verbs as to form a lexical unit negatable by *nicht*, particularly by introducing the concept of hierarchical underlying semantic structures derived from *DEPENDENZGRAMMATIK*. While drawing heavily on the approach evident in Hammer and Hall-Scheiner, Helbig-Buscha often employs different terms with similar meanings, e.g. *RAHMEN* for *KLAMMER*. Negation is treated in one full chapter and, likely in acknowledgment of the complexity and variety of observed usage, Helbig-Buscha resorts to a list of 15 ‘regularities’ of usage rather than a catalog of hard and fast rules. Unlike the other grammars for advanced learners, some attention is devoted to the effect of intonation in determining alternative meanings for the same *Wortlaut*. By its comprehensiveness, avoidance of prescription in the face of variant usage and attention to intonation, Helbig-Buscha approaches the complexity of the explanations in Duden.

²⁰ Helbig/Buscha notes that „*Nicht* alle Studenten waren verheiratet.“ means that „nur etwa 90% waren verheiratet“ (548).

The differences between these grammars stem from several factors, such as the native language of the intended audience and²⁹ the intended use of the book, but each book does have one common focal point: *Duden: die Grammatik*. In an attempt to identify the points where each explanation for *nicht* and *kein* diverge, the rules outlined by their source in common should first receive mention.

2.4 Duden: die Grammatik

The seventh edition of *Duden: die Grammatik*, which appeared in 2006, combines the work of eight professors whose areas cover the spectrum of syntax-related research. Edited by Dr. Kathrin Kunkel-Razum and Dr. Franziska Münzberg, the newest edition seeks to present a reference grammar for native speakers. The intended audience includes students in secondary school or university, as well as teachers and professors.²¹ The scope of the Duden grammar surpasses that of the grammars for non-native speakers, not only because of the additional information about the spoken and written language, but also because of its reliance on a greater number and wider spectrum sources, both oral and written. The bibliography, which includes standard references in linguistic theory, such as Ferdinand de Saussure, works written by professors at the INSTITUT FÜR DEUTSCHE SPRACHE and of German departments in Germany and abroad, reflects Duden's importance in German linguistic studies as a work that synthesizes the most important research into a reliable reference.

This grammar encompasses the narrowest and most comprehensive elements of language, both spoken and written, beginning in the first chapter with phonemes and graphemes, moving to intonation, and then finally to words. The chapters that discuss parts of

²¹ Kunkel-Razum, Kathrin, and Franziska Münzberg, eds, *Duden: die Grammatik*, 7th ed. Duden 4 (Mannheim: Bibliographisches Institut & F.A. Brockhaus AG, 2006) 5.

speech divide into *FLEKTIERBARE* and *NICHT FLEKTIERBARE WORTARTEN*, followed by sections entitled *WORTBILDUNG*, 30
DER SATZ, *DER TEXT*, and *GESPROCHENE SPRACHE*, all of which further divide into subchapters. In order for the reader to understand German word order, the authors incorporate terminology from different areas of linguistics into their descriptions of the functions and meanings of clauses. For example, the terms *SATZGLIED* and *GLIEDTEIL* signify the *VERSCHIEBBARKEIT* of different elements, while *ERGÄNZUNG* and *ANGABE* derive from the *VALENZ* of a verb. *AKTANT*, *PRÄDIKATIV*, and *ADVERBIALE* refer to the semantic function of *SATZGLIEDER*, and *NOMINAL-*, *ADJEKTIV-*, *ADVERB-*, *PRÄPOSITIONAL-*, and *KONJUNKTIONALPHRASEN* help to describe the *WORTART* and *KASUS* (par.1168). These terms can appear together, in combination, or alone. The mixture of approaches for describing clauses includes the *SATZFELDTHEORIE*²²; a model derived from Noam Chomsky's theory of generative grammar combined with the *SATZFELDTHEORIE*²³ (See Appendix A); and a chart that outlines the *SATZBAUPLÄNE*, which derives its descriptions of possible word order from *VALENZ*. For example, "Prädikat mit nur einer Ergänzung" can be either [Subjekt]+Prädikat, [*Sie*] *lacht.*; [Akkusativobjekt] + Prädikat, [*Mich*] *hungert.*; or [Dativobjekt] + Prädikat, [*Mir*] *ist kalt* (par. 1454) The terms used for the *SATZFELDTHEORIE* include *VOR-*, *MITTEL-*, *NACHFELD*, *LINKE* and *RECHTE SATZKLAMMER*, *VERBERST-*, *VERBZWEIT-*, and *VERBLETZTSATZ* (par. 1339). These terms, that is, those from the *SATZFELDTHEORIE*, help to set forth the word order rules for negation.

²² Kunkel-Razum and Münzberg par. 1339.

²³ Kunkel-Razum and Münzberg par. 1349.

Negation receives an entire chapter of nineteen pages, but includes fewer rules than Helbig/Buscha and adds the term *FOKUS*²⁴, which stems from intonation studies, to its explanations. Though the Duden explanations tend to use a prescriptive tone, they reflect a descriptive approach to explaining negation by frequently using intonation to explain exceptions to rules. For example, the rules for *kein* do not differ from those found in the other references. Duden points out some instances where *nicht* could replace *kein*. In these cases, the negated element receives more emphasis: *Es fehlen keine Schräubchen.—Es fehlt nicht ein Schräubchen.* (See App.B, ex.10d) In comparison to the other grammars' rules for *nicht* and *kein*, Duden often avoids absolute rules for cases in which either could act as a negator, such as when a nominal phrase belongs to the *PRÄDIKAT*. Here, the use of *nicht* vs. *kein* is “schwankend.” For example, *Phrasal: Wir können darauf keinen Bezug nehmen. Nicht phrasal: Wir können darauf nicht Bezug nehmen. Ähnlich: Wir hatten keine/nicht Angst. Ich habe keinen/nicht Hunger* (1438). By acknowledging these cases as exceptions, while refraining from providing any further information about the semantical differences between the examples, the authors create a greater flexibility in the placement and use of *nicht* as far as the non-native speaking reader is concerned. Similarly to the other grammars, Duden includes rules on word order, many of which do not contradict those of previous authors except in using the term *FOKUS*. A greater use of the terms that correspond with those of the *SATZFELDTHEORIE* also set the explanation in Duden apart from the others; these criteria comprise the most rigid rules outlined in the chapter on negation. For example, “die Negation

²⁴ “...derjenige Teil des Satzes, der den höchsten Informationswert enthält und dessen kommunikatives Gewicht durch die Intonation hervorgehoben wird; vgl. auch Rhema“ (1262). For example, *Es scheint, dass Otto die Schere nicht in die Schublade gelegt (hat), sondern in den Müll geworfen hat* (par. 1431). The highlighted portion of the example sentence corresponds with the *FOKUS*.

steht...nie zwischen Vorfeld und linker Satzklammer: *[Anna] *nicht* liest [das Buch]” (1432). Because the chapter on negation does ³² not outline the use of *nicht* and *kein* with an exhaustive list of criteria, but rather by giving special attention to the *FOKUS*, creating a list of rules comparable to those of the grammars for DaF-learners quickly becomes complicated. Duden begins with discussing the scope of *nicht*, albeit in terms of *SONDERNEGATION*. The omission of examples for *SATZNEGATION* clearly indicates that the authors assume the reader knows which *SATZGLIEDER nicht* can cross over as it moves as close as possible to the end of the *MITTELFELD* when negating the entire sentence. Because Duden does not include a wide range of examples for *SATZNEGATION*, readers cannot infer approximately the same rules provided by the other sources.

Most importantly, according to Duden, *nicht* can stand immediately before all *SATZGLIEDER*, except the finite verb.²⁵ If *nicht* negates an element within a *SATZGLIED*, such as the object of a preposition, *nicht* generally precedes the entire *SATZGLIED*. For example, *Sie steht nicht [vor[dem Haus]], sondern vor der Garage.* **Sie steht [vor nicht [dem Haus]], sondern vor der Garage* (1434). If the scope of *nicht* includes the *PRÄDIKAT*, any *ADVERBIALE* or *PRÄDIKATIVE ERGÄNZUNGEN* must be included, therefore *nicht* precedes these elements: *Die Goldkette befand sich nicht [im Tresor]. Der Gärtner war nicht [der Mörder]* (1433). Negation extends beyond rules for the placement of *nicht* and *kein* in this grammar to a discussion of pragmatic negation, *Anna fragte: „Kommst du mit mir ins Kino?“—„Ich muss noch meinen Bericht zu Ende schreiben“, antwortete Beate;* and semantic negation, *Anna ist satt, aber Otto ist noch hungrig.* The authors also discuss the use of double negation in spoken language. Sayings, such as *Kein Feuer, keine Kohle kann brennen so heiß, als heimliche Liebe, von der niemand nichts weiß* reflect this, as do sentences

²⁵ Kunkel-Razum and Münzberg par. 1432.

used to emphasize a point, such as *Es war niemand im Zimmer, der das nicht gewusst hätte* (1439). Helbig/Buscha and Hammer mention other uses of negation, too, but Duden devotes an almost equal number of pages to all aspects of negation instead of focusing only on word order.

In their rules for the use of *nicht* or *kein* all of the sources use terms specifically related to the function of phrases and their forms. The number and detail of rules found in each grammar relates partially to the definitions of the most important terminology, such as *PRÄDIKAT*. For example, Helbig/Buscha and Hall/Scheiner both explain that a *MEHRTEILIGES PRÄDIKAT* can include a past participle, a separable prefix, or an infinitive, however, only Helbig/Buscha mentions that *LEXIKALISCHE PRÄDIKATSTEILE* also belong to this category.²⁶ The rule found for the negation of these components provides sufficient examples for readers who have not read this definition elsewhere in the book, but the same does not apply for Hall/Scheiner. If readers erroneously assumed that Hall/Scheiner defines *PRÄDIKAT* like Helbig/Buscha, they would find the rule regarding “[artikellose Substantive], die fast schon zu einem Teil des Verbs geworden sind” (307) confusing, as Hall/Scheiner also provides a rule for *nicht* preceding infinitives and past participles.²⁷ The confusion would probably not lead to an error, but could lead readers to question which elements belong in the *MITTELFELD*, and which in the *RECHTE SATZKLAMMER*, i.e. to question their true syntactic function. Before analyzing the differences in rules through example sentences, the following section will discuss the most important terms needed for understanding negation rules as defined by each grammar.

²⁶ Helbig and Buscha 550.

²⁷ Helbig and Buscha 305.

In order to determine if each grammar prescribes different rules for negation, or simply the same rules formulated in a different manner, the reader must first understand to what degree the terminology used in each book diverges. As variously indicated, these divergencies are frequent, significantly impact the presentation of negation and suggest a yet-to-be-established ‘canonical’ approach to the topic. All of the necessary terms extend from German sentence structure to the role of the *PRÄDIKAT* and its *VALENZ* in forming a grammatically correct independent clause.

3.1 *Sentence Structure*

While each grammar explains German sentence structure with the *SATZFELDTHEORIE*, the presentations differ slightly from each other despite the general agreement that the *SATZKLAMMER* serves to set off the *VORFELD*, *MITTELFELD*, and *NACHFELD*, from each other.²⁸ They also agree that only one *SATZGLIED* may occupy the *VORFELD*; the *FINITES VERB* or a *SUBJUNKTION*, the *LINKE SATZKLAMMER*; an indefinite number of *SATZGLIEDER*, the *MITTELFELD*; and *PARTIZIP II* or an *INFINITES VERB*, the *RECHTE SATZKLAMMER*.²⁹ Despite broad agreement, there is sufficient diversity in terminology and presentation to cause some uncertainty or even confusion in a learner who might consult more than one of these works. Most books use a variety of terms interchangeably for each category in order to emphasize the various functions of each component. For example, Duden focuses on the idea of the *SATZKLAMMER* in (a) by constructing the *LINKE* and *RECHTE SATZKLAMMER* around the *MITTELFELD*, while

²⁸ Kunkel-Razum and Münzberg 1270; Helbig and Buscha 475; Hall and Scheiner 288; Hammer 455-6.

²⁹ Kunkel-Razum and Münzberg par. 1340; Helbig and Buscha 473-5; Hall and Scheiner 288-9; Hammer 455, 458, 467.

choosing *FINITE VERBFORM* and *ÜBRIGE VERBFORMEN* to replace those terms, respectively, in (b) in order to emphasize the morphological characteristics of the words. 36

Helbig/Buscha omits the *KLAMMER* from its illustrations, favoring instead terms to denote the *WORTFORM* found in each position: *DAS FINITE VERB* and *DAS PRÄDIKATSTEIL* (d). Despite naming the part of speech found in those two positions, the remaining terms, *GLIED 1*, *GLIED 3*, and *GLIED N* (see (c) and (d), refocus the purpose of the diagram as a means for understanding word function within a sentence. Though Helbig/Buscha uses the term *VERBALER RAHMEN* outside of the illustrations and avoids referring to the *FELDER* in general, its illustrations and explanations do not contradict those of the other grammars, except in terminology.

There is a similar divergence in the use and congruity of diagrams among these works, extending in some cases to possible discrepancy between the verbal presentation and its pictorial representation. Hall/Scheiner's two diagrams, though conforming to the *SATZFELDTHEORIE*, contrast with the others' in form. The first, (e), fails not only to separate the *FELDER* with *VERBALFORMEN* clearly, but also to establish a clear position for the equivalent of the *RECHTE SATZKLAMMER*. The authors do hint at the relationship between the finite verb and past participles by printing them in bold face, but create further confusion by using examples of *NICHT-VERBALE PRÄDIKATSTEILE* without clearly explaining their role in the *PRÄDIKAT* of the sentence. The second illustration, (f), replaces *2.POSITION* with *PRÄDIKAT 1*, and introduces *PRÄDIKAT 2* as the final component in a sentence. The combination of examples and terms used to explain German sentence structure in Hall/Scheiner also conforms to those found in Duden and Helbig/Buscha.

Hammer, like the previous authors, provides two different diagrams. The interchangeable use of the terms *BRACKET* and *VERB* amounts to the only difference between the two charts. Hammer also omits the *FELDER* from (h) and (i) for *INITIAL POSITION*—a term which merely identifies the position without regard to the functional element filling that position—and *OTHER ELEMENTS*. This approach corresponds more so with Duden's than with Helbig/Buscha's or Hall/Scheiner's.

For readers unfamiliar with the *SATZFELDTHEORIE*, the lack of conformity in the visual representation of German sentence structure within the same sources could undermine the purpose of explaining syntax with the idea of brackets. First of all, knowing which elements can occupy the *LINKE* and *RECHTE SATZKLAMMER* helps learners identify or construct a specific sentence type. Each grammar addresses the *STELLUNGSTYPEN* as indicators of *FRAGE-*, *AUSSAGE-*, and *NEBENSÄTZE* by stating where each element stands in relation to the finite verb.³⁰ Nevertheless, the illustrations complicate a simple idea by creating an approach dependent upon understanding several formulas. These formulas also tend to oversimplify the elements found in each *SATZFELD* into one-word phrases or typical subject-verb-object sentences. Many examples found in Helbig/Buscha reflect exactly this problem. A simpler alternative would correspond more with Duden's model, which explains which elements may occupy each *SATZFELD* and then provides examples for instances in which the different positions remain unoccupied. Helbig/Buscha's examples stand in stark contrast, with their categorization of positions based in morphology rather than in syntax and lack of brackets. Secondly, understanding the syntactic behavior of these elements proves vital in understanding *SATZNEGATION*, where *nicht*, correctly placed,

³⁰ Kunkel-Razum and Münzberg par. 1342-8; Helbig and Buscha 474-5; Hall and Scheiner 288; Hammer 454-5.

3.2 *Das Prädikat*

In comparison to Hall/Scheiner and Hammer, Duden and Helbig/Buscha place greater emphasis on the importance of the *PRÄDIKAT* by explaining this concept in greater detail. All agree that the *PRÄDIKAT* usually appears in the form of a finite verb—which Duden refers to as *EINFACHES PRÄDIKAT* (par. 1310), and Hall/Scheiner terms *EINTEILIG* (278)—but also that, under certain circumstances, the finite verb requires a complement. For example, *(Ich)habe...gegessen* forms one verbal unit which together reflects *TEMPUS*, *MODUS*, *NUMERUS* and *PERSON* in contrast to *(Ich)esse*, which accomplishes the same goal without another verbal component. Duden refers to these components that work together as *VERBALKOMPLEXE*, which correspond to a *MEHRTEILIGES PRÄDIKAT* (1310). Hall/Scheiner also uses the term *MEHRTEILIG* (278), while Helbig/Buscha and Hammer use neither of these terms. What can correspond to the second verbal component varies among the four grammar sources, but requires special attention, as the rules of negation often assume the reader fully understands these distinctions.

The most common parts of speech recognized as verbal complements include (a) *PARTIZIP II*, (b) *INFINITIVE*, and (c) *PRÄPOSITIONEN ALS TRENNBARE VORSILBEN*³¹. Duden mentions the inclusion of other parts of speech in *MEHRTEILIGE PRÄDIKATE*, such as (d) *ADJEKTIVE*, (e) *SUBSTANTIVE*, and (f) *PRÄPOSITIONALPHRASEN* (1331).

(a) Anna *hat* vorsichtig die Tür *geöffnet*.

(b) Anna *wollte* das Schloss *reparieren lassen*.

(c) Anna *schließt* die Tür *auf*. (par. 1310)

³¹ Duden refers to these separable prefixes as *VERBPARTIKEL* or *-zusätze* (par. 1329). *PRÄFIXEN* denotes what other grammars commonly refer to as *INSEPARABLE PREFIXES*.

(d) [Mit den Ergebnissen] sind die Experten erst jetzt *zufrieden*. (par. 1332)

(e) Ski laufen (par. 1334)

(f) Der warme Wind brachte [das Eis] [zum Schmelzen]. (par. 1337)

Examples (a) and (b) correspond to *VERBALE PRÄDIKATSTEILE*³², which occupy the *RECHTE SATZKLAMMER*, and could precede the finite verb in *VERBLETZTSÄTZE* in the case of example (a), where both parts of the *VERBALKOMPLEX* would occupy the same bracket.³³ Examples (c) through (f) belong to the category of *NICHT-VERBALE PRÄDIKATSTEILE*. Though these two categories reflect a similar function, namely completing the meaning of the verb, the syntactic behavior differs based on the degree of integration in the *PRÄDIKAT* that the part of speech has attained. Prepositions acting as *VERBZUSÄTZE* (c) serve as the best example for a part of speech with a high degree of integration in the *PRÄDIKAT*. Though some can occupy the *VORFELD*, they generally occupy the *RECHTE SATZKLAMMER* and, in participial forms, occur as a part of the main verb. Duden refers to their function as *NEBENKERNE DES VERBS*.³⁴ Examples (d) through (f) reflect parts of speech with varying degrees of integration, which contributes to the confusion in identifying their syntactic function. Example (d) can reflect an integrated *ADJEKTIV*: [mit dem Ergebnis]

³² Duden does not use this term, but because the term *NICHT-VERBALE PRÄDIKATSTEILE* denotes a specific category of verbal components, I have provided a term that denotes the opposite category.

³³ Kunkel-Razum and Münzberg par. 1312.

³⁴ Kunkel-Razum and Münzberg par. 1328-9.

zufrieden sein (par. 1332) If *zufrieden* did not form a unit with *sein*, the sentence would change to *[[Mit den Ergebnissen] zufrieden] sind die Experten erst jetzt*, derived from *[[mit dem Ergebnis] zufrieden] sein* (par.1332).³⁵

Identifying *INTEGRIERTE SUBSTANTIVE* can occur more easily resulting from following these three criteria. First of all, “Es kann nicht mit einem Artikel versehen werden.” Secondly, „es kann...keine Attribute bei sich haben.“ Finally, „es kann...in einem nachfolgenden Satz nicht mit einem Pronomen wiederaufgenommen werden.“ Duden’s list includes nouns used with verbs such as *fahren, halten, laufen, nehmen, and spielen* (par.1334).

Finally, example (f) introduces a larger category, *FUNKTIONSVERBGEFÜGE*, to which I devote an entire section as a result of the varying explanations found in each source. Like adjectives and nouns, the prepositional phrases can complete the meaning of a verb, but vary in their degrees of integration. According to the definition of *PRÄDIKAT*, these parts of speech should stand in the *RECHTE SATZKLAMMER*. In comparison with Duden, only Helbig/Buscha provides a comparable amount of information regarding items it terms *GRAMMATISCHE* and *LEXIKALISCHE PRÄDIKATSTEILE*.³⁶

³⁵ According to Blühdorn’s assessment, *mit den Ergebnissen zufrieden* corresponds to a *KONSTITUENTE* and would take the following form:

..., (dass) [die Experten [erst jetzt [mit den Ergebnissen zufrieden]] sind]]

The *V-letztstellung* for the *zufrieden sein* would take this form:

..., (dass)[die Experten [[erst jetzt [mit den Ergebnissen [zufrieden]]]] sind]]

Please see the section on Blühdorn for the remaining explanation.

³⁶ Helbig and Buscha 448.

The terms *GRAMMATISCHE* and *LEXIKALISCHE PRÄDIKATSTEILE* correspond to Duden's terms *VERBALE* and *NICHT-VERBALE PRÄDIKATSTEILE*, though the *LEXIKALISCHE PRÄDIKATSTEILE* differ slightly because they include different parts of speech. In addition to nouns, *VERBZUSÄTZE*—referred to here as *PRÄFIXE* and *ADVERBIEN*—and *FUNKTIONSVERBGEFÜGE*, Helbig/Buscha also includes *DAS REFLEXIVPRONOMEN SICH* and *INFINITIV DES VERBS (MIT ODER OHNE ZU)* to the category of non-verbal predicate components. The categorization of nouns differs only from Duden's in presentation, classifying them as *SUBSTANTIVE (NEBEN VOLLVERBEN)*, such as *Er fährt Auto*; or as *SUBSTANTIVE (NEBEN KOPULAÄHNLICHEN VERBEN)*, such as *Dieses Ergebnis bedeutet eine Niederlage*. Helbig/Buscha also mentions that *LEXIKALISCHE PRÄDIKATSTEILE* do not always have to appear in order to form a grammatically correct sentence, but neglects to stipulate under which circumstances. A comparison of Hall/Scheiner's and Hammer's explanations with Duden's and Helbig/Buscha's reveals what little importance Hall/Scheiner and Hammer attribute to *VERBALKOMPLEXE* (449-50).

Hall/Scheiner attributes only *PARTIZIP II*, *INFINITIVE*, and *VORSILBEN* to *PRÄDIKAT 2* (278), however, the chapter on negation features a rule for using *nicht* instead of *kein*, which refers to a particular group of nouns as *ARTIKELLOSE [SUBSTANTIVE]*, *DIE FAST SCHON ZU EINEM TEIL DES VERBS GEWORDEN SIND*. The list resembles Duden's *INTEGRIERTE SUBSTANTIVE* and Helbig/Buscha's *SUBSTANTIVE NEBEN VOLLVERBEN* most closely. No other rules acknowledge this non-verbal relationship, and consequently do not clarify their syntactic role. Hammer also refers to a group of nouns with a strong relationship to the finite verb as *PHRASAL VERBS*, which act similarly to separable prefixes. In one instance, he states that they stand at the “last part of the *MITTELFELD*,” and at the end of the same paragraph, that they “could be considered as constituting the final

portion of the verb bracket rather than as elements within a clause” (Hammer, 481). The lack of agreement on the syntactic role of a 44 non-verbal element acting as a complement to the finite verb reflects Duden’s contention that the degree of integration varies greatly.³⁷ The explanations for the *FUNKTIONSVERBGEFÜGE* underline the continued importance of understanding the syntactic role of the *PRÄDIKAT*, in addition to the diverging explanations regarding the non-verbal components’ integration.

3.3 *Das Funktionsverbgefüge*

Duden and Helbig/Buscha provide criteria by which the reader can identify a *FUNKTIONSVERBGEFÜGE*. By contrast, Hammer and Hall/Scheiner do not. Instead, Hammer’s explanation for *PHRASAL VERBS* encompasses the other authors’ separate category of *FUNKTIONSVERBGEFÜGE*³⁸, whereas Hall/Scheiner explains that they are “feste Wendungen, die aus einem Verbalsubstantiv (einem von einem Verb abgeleiteten Substantiv) und einem Funktionsverb (einem Verb fast ohne eigene Bedeutung)...[und] haben meist die gleiche Bedeutung wie das Verb, von dem das Substantiv abgeleitet ist.“ These verbal units can have an active or passive meaning. For example, *Steuerzahler bekommen Ratschläge von Steuerexperten.* vs. *Steuerbetrug steht unter Strafe* (87). Fortunately for advanced learners, whose understanding of the definitions and terminology may not help, Hall/Scheiner also features a list of *FUNKTIONSVERBGEFÜGE* at the end of the book to which readers can refer, which may therefore help these learners infer their distinguishing characteristics.

³⁷ Kunkel-Razum and Münzberg par. 1331.

³⁸ Hammer, 302.

The number and type of criteria differ between Duden and Helbig/Buscha, however, they agree on the following rules. 45

First, neither a pronoun nor a *PROADVERB* can substitute for the “noun.” Secondly, no other article can replace the article most commonly associated with the “noun” as part of the *FUNKTIONSVERBGEFÜGE*. Thirdly, nothing may modify the “noun.” Fourthly, those with prepositional phrases use *nicht* for negation. Finally, those with a “noun” in accusative position/function rarely can occur in the passive form.³⁹ In addition, they both define *FUNKTIONSVERBEN* as “Träger der verbalen Morphologie” that express “allgemeinere verbale Bedeutungsaspekte” (par. 580) and view the “noun” as containing the meaning of the verbal unit.⁴⁰ The types of *FUNKTIONSVERBGEFÜGE* fall under two categories: those with a (a) noun in accusative and those with a (b) prepositional phrase. Duden characterizes those with accusative as generally expressing a transitive property and those with prepositional phrases as expressing either a transitive or intransitive property. The remaining subcategories define the different types according to their semantic and syntactic qualities. For example, (c) features the *Sondermittler* as a dative object, which becomes the subject of (d), both of which have the same semantic meaning of *BENEFIZIENT*. These two examples reflect how the syntactic function of the noun changes when using a *FUNKTIONSVERBGEFÜGE*, but the semantic function remains constant.

(a) einen Beitrag leisten (par. 582)

(b) zum Ausdruck kommen (par. 586)

(c) Man *erteilt* [dem Sondermittler] *die Erlaubnis*, [seine Untersuchungen auszudehnen]

⁴⁰ Helbig and Buscha 70; 87.

(d) [Der Sondermittler] *erhält die Erlaubnis*, [seine Untersuchungen auszudehnen] (par. 585)

Helbig/Buscha provides many subcategories that would allow a non-native speaker to identify *FUNKTIONSVERBGEFÜGE* based on syntactic, morphological, and semantic criteria. Passive and active comprise the semantic subcategories, while the subcategories of *FUNKTIONSVERBEN NUR MIT PRÄPOSITION*, *NUR MIT AKKUSATIV*, and *MIT AKKUSATIV ODER PRÄPOSITIONEN* compose the morphological categories. Finally, Helbig/Buscha characterizes them according to their *DURATIV*, *INCHOATIV*, and *KAUSATIV* qualities (see a, b, and c below). As part of the *LEXIKALISCHE PRÄDIKATSTEILE*, *FUNKTIONSVERBGEFÜGE*, as admitted by both Duden and Helbig/Buscha, also reflect varying degrees of integration in the *PRÄDIKAT*. From this problem, the reader could attribute contradictory rules of the usage of *nicht* and *kein* with these verbal components to its stage of development.

(a) Angst *haben* [dur]⁴¹

(b) Angst *bekommen* [incho]⁴²

(c) in Angst *versetzen/halten* [caus]⁴³ (93)

⁴¹ “FVG, die einen Zustand oder ein Geschehen (Vorgang, Tätigkeit) in seinem *Ablauf* bezeichnen [sind] *durativ*“ (85).

⁴² “FVG, die die *Veränderung* eines Zustands oder Geschehens, den Übergang von einem Zustand (Vorgang) in einen anderen bezeichnen [sind] *inchoativ*“ (86).

⁴³ “FVG, die das *Bewirken* einer Zustands- (oder Vorgangs-) *veränderung* (a) oder eines Zustands (*Vorgangs*) (b) durch Fremdeinwirkung bezeichnen [sind] *kausativ*“ (87).

Up to this point, the explanations have focused on how the *PRÄDIKAT* creates boundaries within German sentences, but has⁴⁷ not discussed how the verb stipulates which other elements must appear in order to construct a grammatically correct sentence. The concept of *VALENZ*, a term which refers to this function, also requires special attention in negation.

3.4 *Valenz*

Despite the common reliance on *VALENZ* to explain grammar, the sources diverge in the terms used and the degree of detail with which they define those terms. All four grammars use *ERGÄNZUNG* and *ANGABE* to describe the function of *SATZGLIEDER* as dictated by the verb. These terms stem from the concept of *VALENZ*, which describes how a verb “[eröffnet] bestimmte Leerstellen im Satz..., die besetzt werden müssen bzw...können” (Helbig and Buscha 57). Examples (a) through (c) demonstrate the *VALENZ* of *geben*. Example (a) shows how a dative and an accusative object complete the meaning of *geben*, though the dative object must not appear to form a grammatical sentence, as example (b) demonstrates. Duden, Hall/Scheiner, and Hammer would refer to *eine Katze* as an *ERGÄNZUNG* (Duden 521; Hall and Scheiner 278; Hammer, 348), while Helbig/Buscha would use the term *OBLIGATORISCHER AKTANT* (57). Even to an advanced learner, the semantic force of “obligatorisch” does appear to contrast with the sense that the unmodified term “Ergänzung” is optional, thus providing an opportunity for confusion. *Mir* must not appear in the sentence, though only if the context clearly indicates the indirect object.⁴⁴ Duden, Hall/Scheiner, and Hammer would also refer to *mir* as an *ERGÄNZUNG*. Helbig/Buscha, like Duden and Hammer, retains the original term *AKTANT*, though modified by *FAKULTATIV*, instead of *OBLIGATORISCH*. Duden uses *WEGGLASSBAR* and *NICHT WEGGLASSBAR* synonymously with Helbig/Buscha’s terms.

⁴⁴ Kunkel-Razum and Münzberg par. 1182.

ANGABE, according to Duden, Helbig/Buscha (*FREIE ANGABE*), and Hall/Scheiner denotes “eine Phrase, die ein Wort, eine Phrase oder unter Umständen auch den gesamten Satz modifiziert. Sie ist im Valenzrahmen der zugehörigen Wörter nicht angelegt“ (Duden par.1180). *Letztes Jahr* in example (c) acts as an *ANGABE*.

- (a) Mein Vater gibt mir eine Katze.
- (b) Mein Vater gibt eine Katze.
- (c) Mein Vater gab mir letztes Jahr eine Katze.

The fact that the authors use different terms, which they then define with varying amounts of detail, causes a problem that readers can easily solve simply by reading closely. But, the greater problem lies in the inconsistent usage of modifiers that clearly underline the function of a term, thereby freeing learners from the need to refer to a lengthy definition in order to understand a relatively simple concept. The final key to understanding the different terminologies used lies in the concept of *SATZGLIEDER*, which essentially underlie the placement of *nicht*.

3.5 *Das Satzglied*

The concept of the *SATZGLIED* plays a central role in understanding negation, but does not appear consistently as such across the sources, nor do the authors subdivide the term into the same categories. The problem of identifying the parts of the *PRÄDIKAT* also causes a problem in defining *SATZGLIEDER*. Of the different sources, Hammer neither uses the term *SATZGLIED*, nor provides a similar term or definition. The term *ELEMENT* appears to resemble most closely a category indicating the function of words and

phrases within a sentence.⁴⁵ Duden, Helbig/Buscha, and Hall/Scheiner agree that *SATZGLIEDER* correspond with “eine Einheit des 49 Satzes, die allein die Position vor dem finiten Verb besetzen kann“ (Duden par. 1175). Duden proposes three main categories: *AKTANT*—which can fulfill the roles of *SUBJEKT*, *AKKUSATIV-*, *DATIV-*, *GENITIV-*, or *PRÄPOSITIONALOBJEKT-*, *PRÄDIKATIV*, and *ADVERBIALE*. Each can function as an *ERGÄNZUNG* or as an *ANGABE*. (Duden par. 1184-5) Helbig/Buscha, in contrast, proposes *PRÄDIKAT (PRÄDIKATSTEIL)*, *PRÄDIKATIV*, *SUBJEKT*, *OBJEKT*, and *ADVERBIALE*, many of which can act as *PRIMÄRE* or *SEKUNDÄRE SATZGLIEDER*. In *Ich koche ihm Spaghetti*, the dative object *ihm* would fall under the category *SEKUNDÄRES SATZGLIED*, as the *VALENZ* of *kochen* requires only a subject and accusative object.⁴⁶ Hall/Scheiner only proposes the categories of *SUBJEKT*, *PRÄDIKAT*, *ERGÄNZUNG*, and *ANGABE*. While Duden and Helbig/Buscha include further criteria for distinguishing *SATZGLIEDER* from *PHRASEN*, such as by its *VERSCHIEBBARKEIT* (Duden par. 1176) or its *SUBSTITUTIONSMÖGLICHKEIT* (Helbig and Buscha 446), Hall/Scheiner characterizes *SATZGLIEDER* as elements that can become *NEBENSÄTZE*. For example, *Andere fordern mehr Freizeit. Andere fordern, dass ihnen mehr Freizeit zugestanden wird* (Hall and Scheiner, 182).

The comparison of terminology reveals many differences in the terms used, which generally overlap in meaning. When the definitions differ, they do not contradict each other outright, but provide sources of uncertainty or confusion. For example, the parts of speech that may belong to the *PRÄDIKAT* by acting as a *PRÄDIKATSTEIL*, always consist of past participles, infinitives, and

⁴⁵ Hammer 479.

⁴⁶ Helbig and Buscha 447; 462.

separable prefixes. Helbig/Buscha adds nouns to this category; Duden adds nouns, adjectives, and prepositions. While Hall/Scheiner does not acknowledge any of those parts of speech when explaining the *PRÄDIKAT*, it does indicate that certain nouns can form such a strong bond with the finite verb that they act syntactically like separable prefixes.⁴⁷ A definition for *FUNKTIONSVERBGEFÜGE* appears in a separate chapter.⁴⁸ The overall acknowledgement of nouns integrated into the verb could lead to misunderstandings in word order. Duden provides the only explanation that indicates that readers must consider the stage of development in *WORTBILDUNG* when identifying the degree of *FESTIGKEIT* between the noun and verb, and from that, its correct place in the *SATZFELD*. Helbig/Buscha's examples, though clearly indicating their syntactic role, often only indicate the difference between *LEXIKALISCHE PRÄDIKATSTEILE* and *FUNKTIONSVERBGEFÜGE* through the verbs used, without attempting to explain how to distinguish one from the other. Hammer's term *PHRASAL VERBS* encompasses both of these concepts. The definition contradicts itself in relation to its syntactic role. In short, non-native speakers will not find a simple, reliable answer in any of these sources.

An additional area to keep in mind arises in the different presentations of the clause structure. Each author provides several examples, each with different terms to highlight the parts of speech or their function. Neither Helbig/Buscha nor Hall/Scheiner clearly separates the *FELDER* even though both examples show the correct placement of the verb and any of its parts. Their definitions may not contradict Duden's or Hammer's, but readers could misunderstand the strong syntactic relationship between the *PRÄDIKAT* and

⁴⁷ Hall and Scheiner 307.

⁴⁸ Hall and Scheiner 87.

its parts from the given illustrations. The degree to which these differences will influence the readers' ability to negate correctly will reveal itself best through example sentences. The following section will analyze examples chosen based on a particular *SATZGLIED* present, which influences the placement of *nicht*, as well as on the questions they raise.

Examples of the Correct Usage of *nicht* and *kein* Based on the Rules Prescribed

The preceding chapters have illustrated the variations found in the presentations of the grammar concepts needed to understand the basic rules of negation. The following examples will continue to support my contention that the varying definitions could affect the reader's correct application of the prescribed rules. In addition, this chapter seeks to highlight the problems caused by the inconsistent use of terminology caused by a lack of consensus among researchers, as well as the errors which a heavy reliance on poorly explained examples can cause.

Basic negation in German involves the use of either *nicht* or *kein* based on syntactic, semantic, and morphological criteria. Because *nicht* functions as the negator for most *SATZGLIEDER*, the following section will use examples to illustrate the basic rules for using *kein*. Because *kein* negates a well-defined subset of cases, this section treats negation with *kein* first, then moves on to the more numerous and varied cases involving negation with *nicht*. A section presenting examples that focus on the instances in which non-native speakers might have difficulty in determining which negator to use will follow. The final section will discuss the placement of *nicht* in neutral *VERBZWEITSÄTZE*.

In the following section, the authors' names followed by features references to found in Appendix B

4.1 Usage of *Kein*

4.1.1 Example One: Peter hat einen Bruder. (Helbig/Buscha Q1, #2, p.195)

Helbig/Buscha, Hammer, Hall/Scheiner, and *Duden* [Appendix B: 11a-d] all agree that to negate a *NOMINALPHRASE* with 53 an indefinite article correctly, *kein* replaces *nicht ein*. *Peter hat nicht einen Bruder* can also occur, but not as *SATZNEGATION*. According to Helbig/Buscha, Hammer, and Hall/Scheiner [App.B: 12a-c], *nicht ein* would then function as a *ZAHLADJEKTIV* comparable to “not one single” (109) [=App.B: 12b] in English. Each source provides non-native speakers with a sufficient amount of information to apply this rule correctly.

4.1.2 Example Two: Die Mutter hat Kartoffeln eingekauft. (Helbig/Buscha Q1, #3, p. 195)

Each grammar source agrees that if the *NOMINALPHRASE* appears without an article in the positive sentence, such as in the case of indefinite plural nouns, *kein* acts as the negator [App.B: 13a-d] Though *nicht* generally follows *KASUSOBJEKTE* [App.B: 25a-c], examples one and two illustrate an important point: the negator must precede an indefinite noun, in singular or plural, when both stand in the *MITTELFELD*. If the placement of *Kartoffeln* changed to *Kartoffeln hat die Mutter eingekauft*, the negator *nicht* would stand in the *MITTELFELD*: *Kartoffeln hat die Mutter nicht eingekauft*. By remembering this rule, a non-native speaker can avoid mistaking *kein* for functioning only as a means of *SONDERNEGATION*.

4.1.3 Example Three: Er ist nicht/kein Anwalt. (Helbig/Buscha p.555)

Because each grammar stipulates that *kein* negates a *NOMINALPHRASE* with a *NULLARTIKEL* [App.B: 13a-d] and that *nicht* precedes *PRÄDIKATIVE* in the form of nouns or adjectives [App.B: 17a-d], a non-native speaker could find a sentence similar to

example three confusing. Hammer simply states that “*kein* or *nicht* are alternatives...with the verbs *sein* and *werden*: Er ist/wird kein/nicht Lehrer“ (109) [=App.B: 22b], clarifying in the next note that „If *ein* would be used in the positive sentence...then *kein* is used for the negative, e.g.: Er ist ein Schauspieler. Er ist kein Schauspieler“ (109) [=App.B 21b]. This would apply to *Er ist Anwalt* as:

- (a) Er ist Anwalt. → Er ist nicht Anwalt.
- (b) Er ist ein Anwalt. → Er ist kein Anwalt.

Hammer does not provide a clear explanation for when to use *ein* with “nouns denoting professions, nationality, origins or classes of people” (70), which generally have a *NULLARTIKEL*. Helbig/Buscha contends that *Er ist kein Anwalt* could negate either *Er ist Anwalt* or *Er ist ein Anwalt*, the latter meaning that the subjects shares *EIGENSCHAFTEN* and *FÄHIGKEITEN* of the *PRÄDIKATIV*.⁴⁹ *Er ist nicht Anwalt*, however, only corresponds with *Er ist Anwalt*. In addition, if *als* precedes the *PRÄDIKATIV*, *nicht* must act as the negator: *Er arbeitet nicht als Anwalt*. [App.B: 23a] Neither Hall/Scheiner nor Duden addresses the negation of this class of nouns, though Duden does explain when to omit an indefinite article, also highlighting that a modified noun in singular with a *NULLARTIKEL* requires the addition of an indefinite pronoun. Interestingly, neither Hammer nor Helbig/Buscha addresses how to negate a sentence such as *Er ist ein bekannter Anwalt*. Given that *nicht* and *ein* often indicate *SONDERNEGATION* if not converted to *kein*, *Er ist nicht ein bekannter Anwalt* might indicate *sondern ein bekannter Richter*. *Er ist kein bekannter Anwalt*, by contrast, would indicate *SATZNEGATION*, and perhaps, *SONDERNEGATION* as well.

4.1.4 Example Four: Es ist noch nicht/noch kein Sommer. (Helbig/Buscha p. 555)

⁴⁹ Helbig and Buscha 556.

Example four relies on the same rules as example three, though replacing the rule for the *NULLARTIKEL* for nouns indicating profession with the rule for the *NULLARTIKEL* for months and seasons “after *sein* and *werden*” (Hammer, 66). The surprise from this example stems from the addition of *noch* in the examples without an explanation as to why or if *Es ist nicht/kein Sommer* constitutes a grammatical sentence. Hammer lists examples of “some idiomatic uses of *kein* as a determiner” (109) in which three of the six sentences share a temporal characteristic similar to that of *Sommer*.⁵⁰ Helbig/Buscha does explain that “*noch nicht* bezeichnet ein Geschehen, das bis in die Sprechergegenwart nicht eingetreten ist“⁵¹, but fails to state whether *noch* is *OBLIGATORISCH*. Hall/Scheiner also provides a rule for *noch nicht*, but does not use an example that corresponds as closely with *Sommer* as those found in Hammer do.⁵² Finally, Duden also mentions *noch*, but as a means to describe the time period more closely. For example, *Anna kannte Otto noch nicht* (par. 1428). The difference between using *nicht* and *kein* with a noun with a *NULLARTIKEL* applies to example four as well. *Es ist noch nicht Sommer*, according to Helbig/Buscha, indicates that the summer months have not begun, in

⁵⁰ „Sie ist noch keine zehn Jahre alt. Es ist noch keine acht Uhr. Es ist noch keine fünf Minuten her“ (Hammer, 109).

⁵¹ *Nicht mehr* replaces *noch nicht* for „ein Geschehen, das in der Vergangenheit bestand, aber in der Sprechergegenwart nicht mehr besteht“ (Helbig and Buscha, 559).

⁵² Hall/Scheiner contrasts *noch nicht/noch kein* with positive sentences using *schon*. For example, *Er hat seine Koffer schon gepackt. Sie hat ihre Koffer noch nicht gepackt.; Er hat schon Reisefieber. Sie hat noch kein Reisefieber* (312).

contrast to *noch kein Sommer*, which could indicate that the speaker wants to express the lack of summer-like weather s/he expects because of the time of year.⁵³ 56

4.1.5 Example Five: Der andere Reiseleiter kann anderen zuhören.(Hall/Scheiner,Übung 2, #3, p.306)

Hall/Scheiner, unlike any of the other grammar sources, states that “*kein* negiert...artikellose Substantive mit dem Pronomen *andere*” (306) [=App.B: 49c], but strangely, negates example five with *nicht* in the answer key instead of with *kein*. None of the other grammars mention a rule for cases with *andere*. To negate with *kein*, readers would have to see *andere* as having a *NULLARTIKEL*, which would require *kein*. According to the rules provided by other authors, *nicht* follows objects with definite articles and not indefinite nouns, in which case the sentence must use *kein*. The remaining possibility would place only *zuhören* within the scope of *nicht*, which would correspond with *SONDERNEGATION*.

4.1.6 Example Six: Sie hatte Angst. (Helbig/Buscha p.554)

With the exception of Hall/Scheiner’s rules of negation, the negation of phrasal verbs and *FUNKTIONSVERBGEFÜGE* receives much attention in the other grammars. Hammer classifies *Angst haben* as a phrasal verb [App.B: 35b], which generally take *kein* as a negator, thus *Sie hatte keine Angst*. Helbig/Buscha also agrees that the correct negation uses *kein*, but formulates the rule as “wenn bei einem nicht-verneinten Substantiv der Nullartikel steht...in einigen festen Verbindungen: Substantiv + Verb = Verb: Sie

⁵³ Helbig and Buscha 556.

hatte Angst (= ängstigte sich)“ (554) [App.B: 35a]. Duden, on the other hand, does not classify *Angst haben* and does not explain which negator to use. Instead, the reader finds the example under the term “Schwankend”: *Wir hatten keine/nicht Angst* (par. 1438) [=App.B: 38d]. In comparing the rules provided, the lack of agreement suggests once again that researchers have not yet achieved a consensus.

4.1.7 Example Seven: Tennis spielen

Spielen appears in more of the grammar sources’ examples than any other noun-verb combination, but unfortunately for advanced learners, each source explains the negation of these particular units differently. Hammer’s presentation lacks clarity due to his use of the terms “phrasal verbs” and “noun[s]...felt to be the equivalent of a separable prefix, as [they are] so closely connected with the verb” (Hammer, 108) (see above: *Angst haben*). The latter definition describes not only combinations such as *Klavier spielen*, *Schi laufen*, *Wort halten*, *Auto fahren*, and *Maschine schreiben* [App.B: 31b], but also serves as part of the definition for phrasal verbs that most closely corresponds to what the authors denote as *FUNKTIONSVERBGEFÜGE*.⁵⁴ Despite the overlap in definitions, the rules for negation diverge: *kein* generally negates “phrasal verbs with nouns”, such as *Abstand halten*, *Er hält keinen*

⁵⁴ According to Hammer, the term “phrasal verb” refers to “extended verb phrases usually [consisting] of a noun (often with no article) or an infinitive or other verbal noun used in a set phrase with a verb, e.g. *Abstand halten*, *Abschied nehmen*, *ins Rollen geraten*, *zur Kenntnis nehmen*, etc. cf. 4.3.3. In respect of their position in the clause such noun portions of phrasal verbs are rather similar to separable prefixes, and they could be considered as constituting the final portion of the verbal bracket rather than as elements within the clause” (481).


Abstand, (Hammer [32b]) while *nicht* negates combinations such as *Klavier spielen*, *Sie spielt nicht Klavier* [App.B: 30b, 31b]. 58

Following Hammer's rule, *nicht* would negate *Tennis spielen*: *Ich spiele **nicht** Tennis*. Despite the unclear distinction between the two types of noun-verb combinations, Hammer provides a sufficient number of examples to help a non-native speaker understand that a difference exists, however, he also includes an example which contradicts his two rules. *Tennis spielen* appears under the instances where *nicht* or *kein* can act as negator [App.B; 32b].

(a) *Ich spiele **nicht** Tennis*.

(b) *Ich spiele **keinen** Tennis*.

Helbig/Buscha does not confuse the two, but only allows for *nicht* to negate what it refers to as a *LEXIKALISCHER PRÄDIKATSTEIL* [App.B: 30a].⁵⁵ Similarly to Hammer's explanation, Helbig/Buscha illustrates how the *ABHÄNGIGKEITSSTRUKTUR* resembles that of a *GRAMMATIKALISCHER PRÄDIKATSTEIL*:



⁵⁵ *FUNKTIONSVERBGEFÜGE* are regarded as/classified among *LEXIKALISCHE PRÄDIKATSTEILE*. (Helbig/Buscha, 450)

Though clearer than Hammer's, this explanation fails to provide a sufficient number of examples, leaving the reader to rely on *Er spielt nicht Klavier* (551) in order to conclude that *Tennis spielen* would become *Ich spiele nicht Tennis*. 59

In comparison to the previous two grammars, Hall/Scheiner provides one simple explanation, “*nicht* steht anstelle von *kein*...vor artikellosen Substantiven, die fast schon zu einem Teil des Verbs geworden sind,” (307) [=App.B: 30c] substituting a wide range of examples for terminology. This list includes *Tennis spielen*. Finally, Duden's examples found under “Schwankend” (par. 1438) do not include any noun-verb combinations that resemble *Tennis spielen*. The non-native speaker unfamiliar with the particular syntax rules for these nouns should rely on grammars written for learners of German as a Foreign Language in order to learn the proper rules of negation for these noun-verb elements.

In this section, we observed increasing complexity in properly choosing *kein* as the appropriate negator as the degree of lexicalization of noun-verb combinations, e.g. *Tennis spielen*, also increased. In the following section, we will also observe increasing complexity—and variation in presentation—in describing negation with *nicht*. The *FUNKTIONSVERBGEFÜGE* and *PRÄPOSITIONALOBJEKTE* are one area where lexicalization plays an important role. In addition, the incorporation of additional modifiers of various sorts into the *SATZFELD/MITTELFELD* introduces further complexities of interpretation involving differences between *SATZNEGATION* and *SONDERNEGATION*, some of which are evidently resolved by references to intonation, a topic addressed only sporadically in these works.

4.2 The Correct Placement of *nicht*

Each grammar defines the placement of *nicht* within an independent clause by the presence of specific *SATZGLIEDER* in the corresponding *MITTELFELD*. In general, the various rules outlined agree that *nicht* stands at the end of an independent clause unless (a) a *PRÄDIKATIV* or (b) *ERGÄNZUNG*, excluding (c) *KASUSOBJEKTE*, occupies the *MITTELFELD* or (d) any element stands in the *RECHTE SATZKLAMMER* in which case *nicht* precedes this element.

- (a) Er wird nicht Rechtsanwalt. [App.B: 17a]
Er wird nicht krank. [App.B: 17a]
Sie nennt ihn nicht *fleißig*. [App.B: 20a]
- (b) Sie sind gestern nicht nach Aalen gefahren. [App.B: 17a]
Sie legte das Buch nicht auf den Tisch. [App.B: 17a]
- (c) Der Reiseleiter mag Peter/Herrn Müller/London **nicht**. [App.B: 25c]
Er findet das Buch *nicht*. [App.B: 25a]
- (d) Er wird morgen *nicht* abreisen. [App.B: 4a]
Er ist gestern *nicht* abgereist. [App.B: 4a]
Er reist heute *nicht* ab. [App.B: 4a]

A few explanations do not agree completely with the others, primarily in relation to the placement of *nicht* when

ADVERBIALE BESTIMMUNGEN occupy the *MITTELFELD*. An analysis of the following examples will serve to illustrate how each grammar would guide the reader to negate each sentence correctly.

4.2.1 Example Eight: Das Kind bedankte sich für die Schokolade. (Helbig/Buscha Q5, # 7, p.197)

Hammer does not provide an explicit rule for *PRÄPOSITIONALE OBJEKTE*, but rather a rule that requires a full understanding of *SATZGLIEDER*. He states, “*nicht* precedes verb complements” [App.B: 17b], a category to which prepositional

objects belong, when negating an entire clause.⁵⁶ These rules appear approximately seventy-five pages apart from each other and, 61 other than in repeating the technical term *VERB COMPLEMENT*, is not cross-referenced. If the learners do not know what constitutes a verb complement, a second rule provides further information from which they could deduce a rule, namely that “*nicht* may follow prepositional objects...if it is relatively unstressed and the complement itself is to be given prominence” (479) [= App.B: 29b]. Though not explicitly stated, this rule suggests that *Das Kind bedankte sich für die Schokolade nicht* would only negate *für die Schokolade*. Furthermore, the rule implies that *nicht* generally stands directly in front of prepositional objects. Though the first rule provides the answer *Das Kind bedankte sich nicht für die Schokolade*, the clarity of the explanation for readers remains questionable due to the location of the information needed to understand each rule.

In order for the readers to interpret the information correctly, they must understand both when and how to use *nicht*, as well as the concept of *VALENZ*. Under “negation”, Hammer’s index only provides the pages for a section explaining when to use *nicht* vs. *kein*, found in a chapter entitled “Other determiners and pronouns.” By referring to the German word index, readers find several different references for *nicht*, including the same section found under “negation” in the index, as well as brief mentions in the chapters on modal particles, conjunctions, and finally, word order. The chapter on word order, which outlines rules clearly, requires the reader to understand basic concepts well that preceding chapters explain, such as parts of speech and *SATZGLIEDER*. In the case of verb complements, Hammer lists several examples that do not specify whether a prepositional phrase acts as an object or acts as an adverbial, which poses a problem. Of the six sentences, five have prepositional phrases, two of which correspond to direction, two to

⁵⁶ Hammer 348-9.

location, and only one to a prepositional object. As Hammer assumes that the learner can distinguish between the two, the rule simply states that *nicht* must precede verb complements, but a less experienced learner might not find this rule obvious. If the reader has a firm understanding of Hammer's grammar terms, Hammer's rule provides an unambiguous guideline for *SATZNEGATION* in sentences containing prepositional objects.

Helbig/Buscha, by contrast, states that *nicht* can stand directly before or after a *PRÄPOSITIONALOBJEKT*. *Das Kind bedankte sich nicht für die Schokolade* can have two different meanings depending on the intonation pattern used by the speaker. If the speaker uses a normal intonation pattern, *nicht für die Schokolade* reflects *SATZNEGATION*, however, if the speaker uses a contrasting intonation pattern, *nicht* only negates the prepositional object. *Das Kind bedankte sich für die Schokolade nicht* has only one interpretation, namely, that of *SATZNEGATION*. [App.B: 28a] In addition, Helbig/Buscha provides other information that could help lead the reader to reach the same conclusion without an explicit rule about prepositional objects. For example, *nicht* cannot follow *VALENZ-GEBUNDENE GLIEDER*, "obligatorische oder fakultative Aktanken, die ebenfalls mit dem finiten Verb eine Satzklammer bilden" (Helbig/Buscha 550) [=App.B; 24a]. Because prepositional objects function not only as *SATZGLIEDER*, but as *PRIMÄRE SATZGLIEDER*⁵⁷, a reader more familiar with grammar could apply this negation rule correctly without the need for further information.⁵⁸

⁵⁷ "Unter primären Satzgliedern werden solche verstanden, die vom Prädikat des Satzes (von dessen Valenz) determiniert sind...und von einer Grundstruktur abgeleitet werden können, weil sie selbst Bestandteile dieser Grundstruktur sind. Sekundäre Satzglieder sind dagegen solche, die nicht direkt vom

Hall/Scheiner contends that „*nicht* steht...meist vor Präpositionalobjekten“ (305) [= App.B: 28c] Though the example from 63 this source does not include a sentence featuring *nicht* after a prepositional object, the reader could assume from the explicit guideline that *Das Kind bedankte sich für die Schokolade nicht* also expresses *SATZNEGATION*, but occurs less frequently than *Das Kind bedankte sich nicht für die Schokolade*. Unlike Hammer and Helbig/Buscha, Hall/Scheiner states its rules more in terms of specific *SATZGLIEDER* and word order than general rules related to the *VALENZ* of the finite verb, therefore the learner must rely on this single rule to correctly negate sentences with prepositional objects.

In contrast to the other grammar explanations, *Duden* does not state how to negate sentences based on the *SATZGLIEDER* present, but rather on the identified *GELTUNGSBEREICH DER NEGATION* found by using the *UMSCHREIBUNGSPROBE* “Es ist nicht der Fall, dass...”(par. 1430) [=App.B: 57d]. By using this rule, *Es ist nicht der Fall, dass sich das Kind für die Schokolade bedankte*” calls for the interpretation *SATZNEGATION*, but does not aid in identifying the correct placement of *nicht* within the sentence. Instead of stating explicit rules, *Duden* shows the reader how to derive a *VERBZWEITSATZ* from a *VERBLETZTSATZ* in order to explain how *nicht* can stand at the end of a sentence [1d]. For example, ..., *dass sich [das Kind][für die Schokolade] nicht bedankte*, would become *[Das Kind] bedankte sich [für die Schokolade] nicht*. The placement of *nicht* directly before the *PRÄDIKAT* in the *dass*-clause also corresponds with *Duden*’s rule for *SATZNEGATION*: “Wenn der Fokus [der Negation] das gesamte Prädikat

Prädikat des Satzes (von dessen Valenz) determiniert, vielmehr von einer anderen Grundstruktur ableitbar und deshalb nur lose mit dem finiten Verb verbunden sind“ (Helbig/Buscha 462).

⁵⁸ Helbig and Buscha 458.

mit einschließt, gegebenenfalls zusammen mit Satzgliedern, spricht man von Satznegation.” Unfortunately, Duden does not indicate 64 the placement of *nicht* when a *PRÄPOSITIONALOBJEKT* occupies the *MITTELFELD*. Based on the rules given, readers would assume that *nicht für die Schokolade* corresponds to *SONDERNEGATION* and could not correspond to *SATZNEGATION*. Although *Duden* does emphasize that *SONDERNEGATION* occurs as a result of negating only “ein einzelnes Satzglied oder sogar nur einen einzelnen Bestandteil eines Satzglieds” (par. 1431), a non-native speaker without prior knowledge of the possibility of placing *nicht* before the prepositional object to negate the entire sentence could not reach the conclusion without an explicit rule.

The different grammar perspectives contradict each other on only two points. First of all, only Hammer presents a rule that *SONDERNEGATION* occurs in *für die Schokolade nicht* [App.B: 29b]. Secondly, *Duden* does not suggest the possibility of *SATZNEGATION* when *nicht* precedes a prepositional object. The remaining explanations differ in how they emphasize the possible word order. Hall/Scheiner implies that placing *nicht* after a prepositional phrase can occur, though rarely [App.B: 28c], whereas Helbig/Buscha treats the placement before or after *für die Schokolade* equally. Finally, no grammar departs from the general rule for *SONDERNEGATION*, namely, that *nicht* directly precedes the negated element ([6a];[6b];[6c];[6d]).⁵⁹ Nevertheless, despite the similarities of the various sources, none of them explain the negation of prepositional objects with the same nuances.

4.2.2 Example Nine: Leipzig liegt an einem großen Fluss. (Helbig/Buscha Q6, #2, p.197)

⁵⁹ This rule does not apply to elements moved out of the *MITTELFELD* to the *VORFELD* for emphasis (*Für die Schokolade bedankte sich das Kind nicht.*) or an element in the *VORFELD* receiving the main accent (*Alle* Studenten waren *nicht* verheiratet.). (Helbig and Buscha 548)

The correct negation of sentences requires a firm knowledge of basic German grammar, as the first example shows. The second example follows the same pattern: the learner must recognize that *an einem großen Fluss* functions not only as an adverbial, but more importantly, as an *OBLIGATORISCHE ERGÄNZUNG* to *liegen*. All of the grammars agree that *nicht* must precede an *ADVERBIALE ERGÄNZUNG* [App.B: 24a, 17b, 24c, 17d]: *Leipzig liegt nicht an einem großen Fluss*. Hammer's explanation once again only states the rule as "*nicht* precedes verb complements" (478) [=App.B: 17b], leaving the reader to identify the example that corresponds with a prepositional phrase acting as an obligatory adverbial. Despite this agreement in the placement of *nicht*, not all of the grammars address the possibility of negating the sentences as *Leipzig liegt an keinem großen Fluss*.

Nicht negates *PRÄPOSITIONALPHRASEN* by standing directly before the preposition, instead of directly before the object of the preposition. For example,

Sie steht *nicht* [vor dem Haus]], sondern vor der Garage.

*Sie steht [vor *nicht* dem Haus]], sondern vor der Garage. (Duden par. 1434)

Prepositional phrases can also contain *ARTIKELLOSE SUBSTANTIVE*, *Ich habe Angst vor Spinnen*, or an indefinite pronoun,

Leipzig liegt an einem großen Fluss, both of which *kein* can negate in certain cases. According to Hammer, in *Leipzig liegt an keinem großen Fluss*, *kein* negates only the adverbial complement, not the entire sentence, i.e. *SONDERNEGATION*. (Hammer, 109) [30a] Helbig/Buscha also agrees with *kein* as *SONDERNEGATION*, but adds that *nicht an einem großen Fluss* could be either *SATZ-* or *SONDERNEGATION*. (Helbig/Buscha 555) [28b] Neither Hall/Scheiner nor *Duden* provide a rule. Readers could reach the same conclusion from either of these sources, but based on the rule that *nicht* negates *ADVERBIALE ERGÄNZUNGEN* [App.B: 24c, 17d],

as well as the rule that “*kein* (+Endung) negiert Substantive mit unbestimmten Artikel” [App.B: 13c, 13d], however, they would have the disadvantage of not knowing if a difference between the two sentences exists.

4.2.3 Example Ten: Der Reiseleiter führte die Touristen wegen des schönen Wetters nicht durch das Museum. (Hall/Scheiner Übung 7, #7, p.310)

In contrast to examples eight and nine, example ten introduces an adverbial that must not be present in order to complete the sentence syntactically. The exercise from Hall/Scheiner asks the reader to place specific adverbials (*wegen des schönen Wetters*) within an already negated sentence in order to determine if *nicht* should remain in the same position or move. Because “*nicht* als **Satznegation** strebt nach dem Endes des Satzes und bildet zusammen mit dem finiten Verb eine Negationsklammer,” [1a] a non-native speaker of German must know which elements *nicht* must precede. In the case of *Der Reiseleiter führt die Touristen wegen des schönen Wetters nicht durch das Museum*, *nicht* cannot follow *durch das Museum*, which is a **FAKULTATIVE ADVERBIALE ERGÄNZUNG** [App.B: 24a, 17b, 24c, 17d]. The placement of *nicht* in relation to the **FREIE KAUSALANGABEN** *wegen des schönen Wetters* varies depending upon the grammar source. Hammer contends that *nicht* “follows all adverbials except those of manner” (478) [=App.B: 39b]. Helbig/Buscha, on the other hand, allows for the placement of *nicht* “vor oder hinter freien Kausalangaben, wenn diese durch Präpositionalgruppen repräsentiert sind” (551) [=App.B: 41a]: *Der Reiseleiter führt die Touristen nicht wegen des schönen Wetters durch das Museum*. The rule found in Hall/Scheiner also agrees with that of Helbig/Buscha, though favoring the order *wegen des schönen Wetters nicht*: “*nicht*...steht meist nach Kausalangaben mit Präposition”(309) [=App.B: 41c]. *Duden* does

not provide evidence that *nicht wegen des schönen Wetters* reflects *SATZNEGATION* instead of only *SONDERNEGATION*. If the sentence used *deswegen* instead of *wegen des schönen Wetters*, the rules would change, according to both Helbig/Buscha and Hall/Scheiner: “*nicht* steht [immer]...nach Kausalangaben...[mit] Adverbien” (309) [=App.B: 42; see 42a]. Though *wegen des schönen Wetters* does not appear to affect the placement of *nicht* due to the presence of an *ADVERBIALE ERGÄNZUNG*, comparing the rules for *KAUSALANGABEN* expressed with prepositional phrases in contrast to those expressed by adverbs reveals the importance of understanding the rules of negation in detail.

4.2.4 Example Eleven: Der Reiseleiter war deshalb während dieser Zeit nicht dort. (Hall/Scheiner Übung 8, #2, p.311)

The exercise and answer key indicate that this sentence, in accord with the context, represents a case of *SONDERNEGATION* for *dort*, but because of the rules of negation for *PRÄDIKATIVE*, *Der Reiseleiter war deshalb während dieser Zeit nicht dort* could also reflect *SATZNEGATION*. Though Hammer does not specify if adverbs belong to the category of predicate complements, Helbig/Buscha and Hall/Scheiner do.⁶⁰ *Duden* classifies these adverbs as *ADVERBIALE ERGÄNZUNGEN*.⁶¹ In addition to the overall consensus that *nicht* cannot follow a verb complement [App.B: 24a, 17b, 24c, 17d], Helbig/Buscha specifies that *nicht* can stand in

⁶⁰Hall and Scheiner 279; Hammer 382; Helbig and Buscha 550.

⁶¹ Kunkel-Razum and Münzberg par. 1203.

front of or behind an adverb functioning as a *PRÄDIKATIV*.⁶² Therefore, the position of *nicht* directly before *dort*, does not exclude⁶⁸ the possibility of *SATZNEGATION*.

Similarly to example ten, example eleven highlights the importance of understanding the effect of different adverbials on the position of the negator when negating an independent clause. In this case, the form of the *FREIE TEMPORALANGABE* determines the placement of *nicht*. Hammer's rules for adverbials restrict themselves to distinguishing only between adverbs of manner and all remaining adverbs [App.B: 39b]. Once again, Helbig/Buscha and Hall/Scheiner provide more detail for the non-native speaker.

- (a) Der Reiseleiter war deshalb während dieser Zeit **nicht** dort.
- (b) Der Reiseleiter war deshalb **nicht** während dieser Zeit dort.
- (c) Der Reiseleiter war deshalb einen Tag **nicht** dort.
- (d) Der Reiseleiter war deshalb gestern **nicht** dort.
- (e) Der Reiseleiter war deshalb **nicht** immer dort.

⁶² Compare:

Er ist nicht dort. (Satz- oder Sondernegation)

Er ist dort nicht. (Satznegation)

Er wohnt nicht *in Berlin*.

*Er wohnt in Berlin nicht (Helbig/Buscha 550).

Sentences (a) and (b) illustrate the rule that *nicht* can stand “vor [oder] nach freien Temporalangaben..., wenn diese...Präpositionalgruppen sind“ (Helbig and Buscha 552) [=App.B: 43a]. Hall/Scheiner favors (a), but does not exclude the possibility of (b) [App.B: 43c]. Both grammars agree that only (c) indicates *SATZNEGATION* when a *NOMINALPHRASE* in accusative functions as a *TEMPORALANGABE* [App.B: 44a, 44c]. By contrast, sentences (d) and (e) reflect a problematic rule for a non-native speaker, namely, that “*nicht* steht *nach* solchen Temporaladverbien, die unabhängig vom Standpunkt des Sprechenden sind“ (552) [=App.B: 45a] and „*vor* solchen Temporaladverbien, die vom Standpunkt der Sprechenden abhängig sind“ (552) [=App.B: 46a]. Hall/Scheiner provides a comparable rule, recognizable only by the overlap in examples, as the authors do not specify why the difference exists. Despite this disadvantage for the reader, Hall/Scheiner’s provide a greater advantage, namely, a longer list of examples—from which learners might more accurately generalize—for each category [App.B: 45c, 46c]. Helbig/Buscha, on the other hand, provides approximately five examples for these two categories.

Because neither Hammer nor Duden provide sufficient information for the reader regarding *FREIE TEMPORALADVERBIEN*, non-native speakers would profit more from relying upon Hall/Scheiner’s or Helbig/Buscha’s explicit rules and examples.

4.2.5 Example Twelve: Einige Touristen konnten ihre Reise dieses Mal aus den verschiedensten Gründen nicht gründlich vorbereiten.(Hall/Scheiner Übung 8, #12, p.311)

This example continues to illustrate, just as the other examples have, that *nicht* continues to move past as many adverbials and objects as it can before reaching an element that constitutes a stronger bracket with the finite verb. Identifying the function of

gründlich creates the greatest problem in negating this sentence because none of the grammars use this word in their examples for *FREIE MODALANGABEN*, *MODALWÖRTER*, or adverbs of manner. According to Helbig/Buscha, “*nicht* steht vor freien Modalangaben, unabhängig davon, ob diese...Präpositionalgruppe oder...[Modaladverbien]...sind” (552) [=App.B: 47a], but must follow *MODALWÖRTERN* [48a]. Because the form and position of *MODALWÖRTER* and *MODALADVERBIEN* does not differ greatly, dividing a sample sentence into an independent and dependent *dass*-clause helps to recognize the difference:

(a) Er kommt *vermutlich*.

--Man vermutet (Es wird vermutet, es ist vermutlich so), dass er kommt.

(b) Er kommt *pünktlich*.

--*Es ist pünktlich, dass er kommt.

aber: Es ist so, dass er pünktlich kommt. (430)

In contrast to the previous examples, all of the grammars, except for *Duden*, agree that *Einige Touristen konnte ihre Reise dieses Mal aus den verschiedensten Gründen nicht gründlich vorbereiten* is the correct answer [App.B: 47a, 39b, 47c]. Nevertheless, only Helbig/Buscha mentions that „In Sätzen mit einer Modalbestimmung [können] nur [Modalbestimmungen], nicht aber die gesamte Prädikation negiert werden“ (552). Therefore, only *SONDERNEGATION* can occur in this example.

4.2.6 Example Thirteen: In unserer Jugend sind wir im Sommer nicht gern mit meinem Onkel im Wald spazierengegangen.

(Durrell, Ex. 19, #12, p.190)

Example thirteen serves to complete the explanation of *SONDERNEGATION* in sentences with *MODALADVERBIEN*.

Reformulating the sentence by placing *nicht* in front of different *SATZGLIEDER* reflects the lack of logic in trying to negate the entire

PRÄDIKATION. According to the rules found in the preceding examples, if *nicht* negated the entire sentence, it would have to stand in front of the *FREIE LOKALANGABE* or the *PARTIZIP II*.

(a) In unserer Jugend sind wir im Sommer gern mit meinem Onkel **nicht** im Wald spazierengegangen.

(b) In unserer Jugend sind wir im Sommer gern mit meinem Onkel im Wald **nicht** spazierengegangen.

Neither (a) nor (b) negates the entire sentence, but only the element immediately following: *nicht im Wald, sondern am Strand; nicht spazierengegangen, sondern gerannt*. The *MODALADVERB* has a greater influence on the meaning of the statement made by the sentence, to the extent that the other grammars should mention the impossibility of negating the entire *PRÄDIKATION* with a *MODALADVERB* present.

4.2.7 Example Fourteen: Er will nicht mit uns Kaffee trinken. (Hall/Scheiner Übung 2, #11, p.306)

Example twelve introduces a point of negation not emphasized sufficiently in any of the grammar sources: *MODALANGABEN* take precedence over *SATZNEGATION* (see examples five and six under *nicht*). Given the rules for using *kein*, in addition to the tendency for *nicht* to move as close to the far right side of the *MITTELFELD* as possible, a non-native speaker might negate the example as *Er will mit uns keinen Kaffee trinken*. Because „In Sätzen mit einer Modalbestimmung [können] nur [Modalbestimmungen], nicht aber die gesamte Prädikation negiert werden“ (Helbig and Buscha 552), the negator must focus on *mit uns*, which requires *nicht*.

4.2.8 Example Fifteen: Der Reiseleiter geht morgens bestimmt nicht sehr früh aus dem Haus. (Hall/Scheiner Übung 8, #4, p.311)

As discussed in examples nine and eleven, *nicht* cannot follow verb complements or dependent *TEMPORALADVERBIEN*, thus *nicht* cannot move farther right than the position directly before *sehr früh*, at least according to the answer key in Hall/Scheiner. Unlike with *MODALADVERBIEN*, *nicht* cannot precede a *MODALWORT* [App.B: 48a, 48c], such as *bestimmt*. Unfortunately, Hammer does not differentiate between *MODALADVERBIEN* and *MODALWÖRTER*, though examples of both appear on his list of adverbs of manner⁶³, leaving the reader to rely on the rule that *nicht* “follows all adverbials except those of manner” (478) [=App.B: 39b], which would result in **Der Reiseleiter geht morgen **nicht** bestimmt sehr früh aus dem Haus*. Helbig/Buscha categorize *MODALWÖRTER* as *EINSTELLUNGSOPERATOREN*, which cannot be negated.⁶⁴ *Duden* provides more useful information for this example, in that the reader will find that *MODALWÖRTER* belong to the *KOMMENTARADVERBIEN*, which comment on the entire statement. This leads to the discovery that *nicht*—in some instances—belongs to the *EPISTEMISCHE KOMMENTARADVERBIEN*⁶⁵, which then leads to perhaps an easier approach. *MODALWÖRTER* and *nicht* form an inseparable unit that together comment on the entire statement. The *UMSCHREIBUNGSPROBE* provided by Duden supports this idea: *Es ist **bestimmt nicht** der Fall, dass der Reiseleiter morgens sehr früh aus dem Haus geht*.⁶⁶

⁶³ Hammer 142.

⁶⁴ Helbig and Buscha 553.

⁶⁵ Kunkel-Razum and Münzberg par. 868.

⁶⁶ Kunkel-Razum and Münzberg par. 1430.

The analysis highlights several points where the rules for *SATZNEGATION* converge. First, all of the sources agree that *kein* negates indefinite nouns, whether singular with an indefinite pronoun, or plural, with a *NULLARTIKEL*. Secondly, *nicht* generally cannot follow a verb complement, the exception being *KASUSOBJEKTE*, which *nicht* must follow, and *PRÄPOSITIONALOBJEKTE*, which *nicht* can precede or follow. Next, *nicht* can precede *FREIE ADVERBIALANGABEN* in the form of prepositional phrases. Finally, the placement of *nicht* directly before a *SATZGLIED* can indicate *SONDERNEGATION*. However, the remaining rules agree with each other only to a large extent.

The points where the rules diverge from each other include cases where *nicht* and *kein* alternate as negators. This occurs with nouns acting as *PRÄDIKATIVE* that do not take an article, as well as with nouns integrated into the meaning of the finite verb. The rules for the *PRÄDIKATIVE* given by Helbig/Buscha explain the difference in meaning clearly, while Hammer offers the rule that *kein* replaces the *ein* from the positive sentence. Readers who do not know when *ein* would modify this type of noun cannot apply the rule accurately. In reference to the integrated nouns, each reference defines this group with varying degrees of information without reaching a conclusion as to when to use which negator. The final difference lies in the implicit disagreement between Helbig/Buscha and Hall/Scheiner about the frequency of *nicht* before or after *FREIE KAUSAL-* and *TEMPORALANGABEN*. Because the Hall/Scheiner favors one placement over the other, though leaving open the possibility of the other, whereas Helbig/Buscha does not favor either, readers must either decide for themselves which authors' rules indicate the more frequent usage.

The rules also vary in their number of examples and the degree of detail in their explanations, both of which indicate their expectations of their audience. For example, Hammer expects readers to know which *SATZGLIEDER* belong to the category

COMPLEMENTS (See example eight). Helbig/Buscha, by contrast, states that *nicht* must precede *VALENZ-GEBUNDENE GLIEDER* [App.B: 24a], and also provides explicit rules for the *SATZGLIEDER* that belong to this category.

74

Given this diversity in explanations, even where substantive agreement is clear, and given the divergence in explanation indicating lack of consensus on other cases, the question then progresses from how and in what way these grammars contradict each other to whether the audience can apply them successfully given the grammar knowledge they should have after completing the beginner's level of German. In an attempt to answer this question, an analysis of the book *Kontakte* will serve as a guide to what beginner level students learn.

Chapter 5

The Transition from a Beginner's Level Textbook to an Intermediate Grammar: An Analysis of *Kontakte*

The differing explanations for *nicht* and *kein* found in each of the four grammars stem from the intended use of the book. Only Duden, which contains the most comprehensive explanations, seeks to aid native speakers in their understanding, whereas Helbig/Buscha and Hall/Scheiner focus on non-native advanced learners from different language backgrounds. Like Duden, Helbig/Buscha devotes chapters to parts of speech and their functions, but attempts also to outline detailed prescriptive rules to improve readers' accuracy in language production. Hall/Scheiner, by contrast, aims to prepare readers for proficiency exams or higher education in German by practicing complex clause structures, explaining key grammar terms only as needed. Finally, Hammer aims specifically at native English-speaking adult learners with explanations written in English, sometimes discussing grammar points by comparing their form and frequency in the two languages. The three DaF-grammar books formulate rules using the terminology each

respective author has established at some point in his/her own source. The previous chapters attempted to identify whether these largely synonymous concepts differ in meaning or only in form. Another question that arises relates to the audience's readiness for using each respective intermediate grammar.

After completing beginner's level courses, which many universities in the United States distribute across four academic semesters, students generally advance to an intermediate writing or speaking course, during which they would use a separate grammar book, such as Hammer's *German Grammar*. Students who would choose to study abroad instead would likely use Hall/Scheiner's *Deutsche Grammatik* or Helbig/Buscha's *DaF Grammatik* as part of a DaF-course, and perhaps Duden as a reference if they attend university classes for German majors. In either scenario, courses would focus at some point on accurately using *nicht* or *kein*, leading back to the original questions of which source provides the most reliable rules and how well the students are prepared to make use of these rules, no matter how reliable they might be. In order to determine what grammar information students obtain at the beginner's level, the textbook *Kontakte*, written by Erwin Tschirner, Brigitte Nikolai, and Tracy Terrell, will serve as the object of analysis.

Kontakte bases its approach in communicative language teaching as a means to promote "cultural competence" using "the five 'Cs' of Communication, Cultures, Connections, Comparisons, and Communities" (xiii). Each of the twelve chapters, excluding *Einführung A* and *B*, features between fifteen and seventeen communicative partner activities, ranging from information-gap and "autographing" to interviews and role-playing. In keeping with the goal of CLT to provide an "input rich environment," the book

provides two reading selections per chapter, which include pre- and post-reading activities.⁶⁷ Short video clips found at the end of 76 each chapter allow the students to see cultural differences and to practice listening comprehension with the chapter vocabulary and grammar structures.⁶⁸ The authors also provide a vocabulary list, categorized by theme, consisting of between 100 and 150 terms at the end of each chapter. Though the book emphasizes communicative ability over declarative knowledge of grammar, students can use the grammar sections found after the vocabulary list, which should facilitate communication within specific contexts. The explanations generally do not exceed five grammar points. These include several exercises that drill students by asking them to fill-in the blank, match words based on their morphology, or describe pictures using a specific grammar point. Teachers can assign the accompanying exercises as homework or use them in class.⁶⁹ Grammatical accuracy corresponds neither to the authors' goals, nor to the purpose of CLT⁷⁰, but reliance on the grammar section depends on the class context and the individual learner's goals. Assuming that students rely only on the grammar information given by *Kontakte*, the following section will discuss the rules for *nicht* and *kein*, followed by all other grammar rules they would already have learned when confronted with an intermediate grammar book.

⁶⁷ Brandl, Klaus, Communicative Language Teaching in Action: Putting Principles to Work, (Upper Saddle River: Pearson Prentice Hall, 2008)107.

⁶⁸ This analysis does not include the online workbook provided by Quia.

⁶⁹ Tschirner, Erwin, Brigitte Nikolai, and Tracy D. Terrell, Kontakte: A Communicative Approach, 6th ed. (Boston: McGraw-Hall, 2008) xviii.

⁷⁰ Brandl emphasizes the importance attaining automaticity by teaching “grammar within contexts and through communicative tasks”(19) instead of “explicit knowledge of grammar” (126).

According to *Kontakte*, students need to know two main rules in order to negate. First, “*NOT = NICHT.*” For example, “Ist Jens groß? Nein, er ist **nicht** groß, er ist klein“ (41). Secondly, „**kein** and **keine** (*not a, not any, no*) are the negative forms of **ein** and **eine**.“ For example, „Im Klassenzimmer sind **keine** Fenster.“ and “Stefan hat **keinen** Schreibtisch“ (99). Three additional mentions of *nicht* do not constitute rules, but do provide students with a „chunk“ they can easily memorize.⁷¹ The first, found in *Kapitel 1*, places *nicht* before *gern* to express *do(es) not like to [do X]*.⁷² The second focuses on meaning, rather than word order: *nicht müssen* means *do not have to* and *nicht dürfen*, *mustn't*. For example, “Du musst das nicht tun. *You don't have to do that.* or: *You don't need to do that.*” and “Du darfst das nicht tun. *You mustn't do that*” (132). The final mention of *nicht* in a grammar section appears in the seventh chapter, and like the rule for *nicht gern*, provides a chunk to memorize when negating comparatives: *nicht so...wie*. For example, “Die Zugspitze ist **nicht so hoch wie** der Mount Everest” (258). *Kontakte* does not provide any additional rules for *nicht* or *kein*, which serves as an advantage for learners before the introduction of direct objects in *Kapitel 2*.

By the time *Einführung B* introduces *nicht*, students use *nein* as the only means of negation. The communicative exercises not only avoid eliciting a response beyond *ja* or *nein*, but also focus on communicating with sentences that do not require a grammar explanation because of their similarity to L1. The low learning burden of this grammar point allows learners to accommodate such a

⁷¹ According to Ellis, “a lot of language learning can be accounted for by associations between sequentially observed language items. That is, without the need to refer to underlying rules. The major factor affecting this learning by association is frequency of meeting with the instances of language use...By having chunks of language in long-term memory, language reception and language production are made more effective” (Nation, 321).

⁷² Tschirner, Nicolai, and Terrell 71.

simple rule, such as “NOT = NICHT” easily.⁷³ For example, the sentence *Ich bin glücklich* translates into English as *I am happy*.⁷⁸ *Ich bin nicht glücklich* translates perfectly to *I am not happy*. The authors avoid instances within the introductory chapters where *nicht* could not act as negator, such *Ich trage *nicht einen Rock*. Instead, the activities govern the responses by only asking for *wer* or *was*. If they allow for the answer *nein*, the modeled example does not include a negated sentence. Therefore, the introduction of *nicht* without a rule for the placement with the *KOPULAVERB sein* and an adjective functioning as a *PRÄDIKATIV* does not put students at a disadvantage. The simplicity of the rule should also aid in lowering the processing demands when the learners meet *nicht* in different contexts, leading to better lower-level processing and, eventually, better higher-level processing as the students progress through the course material.⁷⁴ By the first main chapter, the authors can no longer avoid addressing *nicht* and word order due to the introduction of present tense verbs and the concept of *gern*.

In the case of *sein*, students could rely on intuition from L1 to understand L2, but as soon as *Kapitel 1* makes clear that only one set of conjugations expresses the present tense, as opposed to three different forms in English, the simple rule for *nicht* could cause confusion. If students translated *I don't cook* or *I'm not cooking*, they might be tempted to say **Ich nicht koche* because *not* precedes the main verb in English. The authors do not address this problem, but rather skirt it by focusing on the word order for very useful expression *nicht gern* as the next important point. This chapter also provides the first illustration that demonstrates the

⁷³ Nation, I.S.P, Vocabulary in Another Language, The Cambridge Applied Linguistics Series (Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 2001) 56.

⁷⁴ Brandl 109; 325.

placement of the finite verb in the second position, indicated by II, followed by *auch/nicht/gern*, III, and a complement, IV.⁷⁵ 79

Perhaps students can deduce from this rule that *nicht* would follow *ich koche*.⁷⁶ Interestingly, many of the phrases used for the section on *gern* include nouns that correspond to what Duden calls *INTEGRIERTE SUBSTANTIVE* (See Section 3), such as *Tennis spielen*. In accordance with Hammer's usage that itself parallels German usage of *ERGÄNZUNG*, *Kontakte* refers to these nouns as *COMPLEMENTS*.⁷⁷ Because the book does not introduce *kein* until *Kapitel 2*, students can focus more on placing *nicht gern* before the noun. The structural difference between using *gern* and *to like to do something* results in a higher learning burden for the students, which could explain the authors' giving the students a phrase to memorize instead of introducing a rule.

With the introduction of *kein*, though this also occasions a simple rule, comes the question of how to negate nouns that appear without an article. The book does refer to the nouns, such as *Tennis*, *Musik*, and *Klavier* as "complements" and does explain that direct objects signify "the object of the action implied by the verb, such as what is being possessed, looked at, or acted on by the subject of the sentence" (Tschirner, Nicolai, and Terrell 98). However, the authors do not contrast these two ideas sufficiently for

⁷⁵ Tschirner, Nicolai, and Terrell 71.

⁷⁶ Although the placement of *nicht* after a finite verb in a simple sentence may not seem impossible for a beginner student to internalize, Brandl notes that, "grammar items that are considered easy to learn...may also benefit from more explicit grammar instruction. For example, Pica (1994) found that, in comparing learners of English who received explicit instruction in the use of plural *-s* with those who had never received classroom instruction, the first group used the plural *-s* more accurately than did the uninstructed learners" (112).

⁷⁷ "The complement provides additional information and thus 'completes' the meaning of the verb: **ich spiele**→**ich spiele Tennis**; **ich höre**→**ich höre Musik**" (Tschirner, Nicolai, and Terrell 71).

learners to remember or understand that a difference exists between the two. Nevertheless, both of these explicit rules provide a relatively clear guideline for when to use each negator, especially considering that the activities support comprehensible communication at the beginning level, as opposed to accurate grammar usage.

The correct placement of *nicht* clearly does not play an important role in beginner level grammar, as indicated by *Kontakte's* few rules regarding negation, but strangely arises noticeably in several grammar exercises. Beginning with *Kapitel 3, Übung 3* provides a scenario that requires constructing sentences with *müssen* and *nicht dürfen* from nine given phrases of varying degrees of complexity. Three of these phrases, (1) *mit Jens zusammen lernen*, (2) *viel fernsehen*, and (3) *jeden Tag tanzen gehen* (132) could cause confusion, especially when contrasted with the answers given for other exercises in the same chapter. How could a student reason that *nicht* precedes the elements following *Er darf...* in examples (1) through (3), but in Übung 6 of the same chapter, would follow a direct object, such as *Ich kann das deutsche Alphabet/es nicht aufsagen* (134)? Übung 3 of *Kapitel 10* raises a similar question when requiring the negation of *du*-imperatives, which feature a variety of elements in each sentence, such as *INTEGRIERTE SUBSTANTIVE, TEMPORALADVERBIEN, PRÄPOSITIONALOBJEKTE, OBLIGATORISCHE ORTSANGABE, and FREIE MODALANGABE*. For example, (4) *Üb jetzt nicht Klavier*, (5) *Rede im Moment nicht mit mir*, (6) *Geh nicht in den Garten* (364). Up until *Kapitel 10*, the authors give few exercises requiring students to use *nicht* in their responses. Learners have the option of comparing their answers with those found in the answer key located at the back of the book. The final example, also found also in *Kapitel 10*, strangely, does not include answers in the answer key. The prompt indicates that the given sentences should be formulated into questions in subjunctive with *nicht*. One sentence in particular reflects a specific rule on *TEMPORALADVERBIEN* requiring

memorization: (7) *Ich lese jetzt (später, morgen)* would become *Ach, könntest du nicht später lesen?* or *Ach, könntest du morgen nicht lesen?* [42a, 43a; 42c, 43c] Because the book does not provide an explicit rule for the correct placement of *nicht* to negate the entire sentence when a *TEMPORALADVERB* occupies the *MITTELFELD*, learners must rely on either the rules given or the rules they have inferred from other examples, neither of which would lead them to negate these sentences correctly. In addition, students could assume that the absence of answers for this particular exercise means they need not worry about the placement of *nicht* in any of these sentences. Alternatively, these sentences might constitute additional instances of “chunking” first observed in *nicht gern*.

The strangeness of eliciting *nicht* or *kein* also stems from the fact that the remaining grammar exercises that require negation generally occur in dehydrated sentences, in which the negator appears in the same position it will retain once the learner has constructed the correct sentence. For example, *nicht allein im Park/laufen* (107) would become *Lauf nicht allein im Park*. These sentences occur in isolation, several times throughout chapters two and three, and then not again until chapters nine through twelve. This procedure in dehydrated sentences circumvents a more complex explanation while other communicative capabilities are developed. *Nicht* does not occur enough throughout the main communicative tasks within each chapter or in the grammar exercises for readers to obtain a sufficient amount of input to internalize the rule.

The appearance of *nicht* throughout the book does not occur in such a manner that would necessarily result in students internalizing specific rules for word order beyond knowing that *nicht* can precede functional elements in a sentence and can end an independent clause that does not contain a *PARTIZIP II* or separable prefix, infinitive. The communicative partner activities, “Situationen”, reflect the sporadic use of *nicht* usually as input rather than output. Chapters one through seven use the word *nicht* at

least once in fewer than 25% of the Situationenen. Few such cases seem designed to elicit *nicht*, but in many of these cases, provide phrases, such as *nicht so gut* (111), *nicht besonders gut*, (124), and *nicht schlecht* (88) as “chunks” or simple stock responses to questions. The remaining chapters use *nicht* in between 25% and 50% of the Situationenen, also as mainly input, rather than in the answer elicited. The appearance of *kein* is negligible. Looking at the grammar pages, *nicht* appears only approximately thirty times over fourteen chapters. This includes in examples for grammar explanations, in modeled examples for exercises, and within the context of the exercise itself, usually in dialogues. As the authors do not focus on the correct placement of *nicht* for *SATZNEGATION*, the low number of occurrences of *nicht* throughout the book point to the authors’ concern that readers comprehend meaning and be able to express negation in a simple, comprehensible manner. The successful use of an intermediate grammar would not depend solely on the knowledge of negation acquired from *Kontakte*, but also on the overall knowledge of grammar acquired.

After completing all twelve chapters, a student should have learned the following in addition to basic conjugation and declination rules. First, the three *STELLUNGSTYPEN* of the finite verb correspond with different functions, namely, questions, declarative statements, and subordinate clauses introduced with *wenn*, *weil*, *ob*, *damit*, *um...zu*, and *nachdem*. Secondly, past participles, separable prefixes, and infinitives must stand at the end of clauses in which the finite verb stands in the second position. Should the finite verb occupy the last position in the sentence, the past participle, separable prefix, or infinitive must directly precede it. Thirdly, accusative and dative objects that follow the finite verb appear in the order dative – accusative, unless the accusative appears in the form of a pronoun, in which case the order of objects changes to accusative-dative. Fourthly, adverbials of time and place should appear in that order if they follow the finite verb. Fifthly, prepositions take specific cases, some alternate between two

Roman numerals indicate the possible positions in the sentence for elements, sometimes appearing with the name of the (a) function ⁸⁴ directly below it. This model appears first in *Kapitel 1* and recurs sporadically throughout the remaining eleven chapters. The final chapter, which provides an overview of key concepts, introduces another variant, which features (f) sentences comprised of two clauses. *Kapitel 10* includes a version that uses *1,2,3* to illustrate an example similar to (e). (327)

(d)	I	II	III	IV
	Subject	erb		Complement
	Wir	spielen	heute	Tennis. (75)

(e)	I	II	III	
	Dependent clause	Verb	Subject	
	Wenn ich krank bin,	bleibe	ich	im Bett.
	Weil sie müde ist,	geht	Renate	nach Hause.
		(136)		

(f)	Clause 1	Conj.	Clause 2
	I II		I II
	Ich muss noch viel lernen,	denn	ich habe morgen eine Prüfung.

Clause 1	Conj.	Clause 2
I II		Last
Ich muss noch viel lernen,	weil	ich morgen eine Prüfung habe.

Clause 1		Clause 2
I		II Subject
Weil ich morgen eine Prüfung habe,	muss	ich noch viel lernen.

(399)

The majority of examples in the grammar explanations use Subject – Verb –Object/Adverbial/etc word order, at times placing an adverbial or a subordinate clause before the finite verb to show readers the flexibility of the *VORFELD*.

Secondly, the idea of word order within the *MITTELFELD* receives little attention with the exception of the examples listed above and the position of *gern* before a *COMPLEMENT*. The only two explicit rules relate to the order of dative and accusative objects and adverbials, though independent of each other.⁷⁸ Neither the partner activities, nor the grammar exercises seem designed to elicit an answer with a complex *MITTELFELD*. *Kapitel 8* introduces an exception, namely, the verbs *stellen*, *stehen*, *legen*, *liegen*, *setzen*, *sitzen*, and *hängen*, all of which require both a direct object and a *RICHTUNGS*- or *ORTSANGABE*. The authors do not focus

⁷⁸ Tschirner, Nicolai, and Terrell 229; 397.

on the word order patterns that do not differ from English if the Subject remains in the *VORFELD*, but focus rather on the correct declension of the definite article.⁷⁹ 86

Finally, the concept of *VALENZ*, which receives much attention in all of the more advanced grammar sources analyzed, does not receive a great amount of attention in *Kontakte*. In the cases where the idea of a verb requiring objects or adverbials overlaps with English usage, the book does not highlight their importance. Exceptions include the introduction of verbs that require dative objects in *Kapitel 6*, prepositions that require specific cases, and the gender of nouns. Beyond those three areas of *VALENZ*, learners would not recognize the difference between an *OBLIGATORISCHE* and a *FREIE RICHTUNGS-* or *ORTSANGABE* without first receiving an explanation of those terms. The overall lack of terms used could pose a problem for the transition from the beginner's to the intermediate level of grammar.

The communicative approach, while helping learners develop their receptive and productive language skills, does not place emphasis on declarative knowledge of grammar, as the intermediate level grammar books do. Hammer anticipates this need by explaining all terms by definition and comparative examples, which would best serve native-English speaking students who have used a book like *Kontakte*. Hall/Scheiner also provides basic definitions, but only as needed to explain more complex sentence structures which the students encounter in reading selections in the textbook, but would not have had to produce themselves. Helbig/Buscha, like Hammer, explains all grammar terminology thoroughly, but employs its own characteristic terms, a heavier emphasis on understanding syntactic structure, and avoids explicit reference to any second language as a point of comparison. Students

⁷⁹ Tschirner, Nicolai, and Terrell 295.

transitioning from *Kontakte* would lack the familiarity with the terminology, as well as some of the key underlying concepts.

However, the lack of knowledge occurs also as a result of the similarity between the L1 and L2. For example, Helbig/Buscha indicates that *nicht* should precede *PRÄDIKATIV* in the form of an adjective, a rule that native-English speakers do not need. A greater knowledge of grammar in general would serve these learners well. In order for them to use any of the grammars effectively though, they would have to work through each source methodically before being able to use the rules on negation successfully.

Aside from specific terms, the concepts that students could transfer from one level to the next would include sentence structure. Despite the differing terms and the limited explanation at the beginner's level, the various illustrations most likely familiarize students sufficiently with the idea in order to understand the *SATZFELDTHEORIE*, which would also help them understand the difference between *SATZGLIEDER* and *PHRASEN*. Understanding *VALENZ* would require additional information, but because they would be able to see the similarity in the L1, the concept might not cause them too much difficulty. Finally, they would require a greater familiarity with complex *MITTELFELDER* in order to understand the placement of *nicht* to negate an entire sentence. Without knowing the basic word order beyond *TEMPORAL* and *ORTSANGABEN*, they would experience difficulty accommodating the detailed rules found in each source. The exposure to *nicht* in phrases, such as *nicht gern*, *nicht so gut*, and *gar nicht* does not occur often enough for learners to internalize the various rules underlying them. If the book were to use these phrases more often, or perhaps, provide rich input with *nicht* in such a way that would support internalization of rules relating to negation, learners could reasonably assimilate other parts of speech from the same categories to these models. Because the book does not do this, memorizing these phrases could not realistically compensate for a lack of explicit rules or not yet acquiring a rule as a result of minimal exposure

to the language.⁸⁰ At a later stage of development, however, these memorized phrases could serve as an example to aid in quickly 88
memorizing a specific rule if the student has retained them.⁸¹ *Kontakte* provides rich input necessary for working toward automaticity
with simple grammatical structures. Given the lack of exposure to complex sentence structures in the communicative tasks and the
lack of negation with *nicht*⁸² and *kein* in any part of the book, students would have to rely on their knowledge of other grammar
structures, while compensating for what they have not yet learned with careful, methodical attention to the rules in one intermediate
grammar book in order to understand fully the rules for negation.⁸³

⁸⁰ Words with similar patterns can lead to a lower learning burden, but the student would have to understand which other parts of speech belong to the
same category. (Nation 56)

⁸¹ Nation 343.

⁸² The students need meaningful interaction with *nicht*, which the book provides only occasionally. The exercises provided as practice may not transfer
to the partner activities as a result of their tendency to drill for form. (Muranoi 163)

⁸³ Nation acknowledges that “attention to form and rules might be supported and prepared for by experience with the items in use” (59) which highlights
the importance of exposure to the many different forms of negation, especially the most problematic examples.

A Different Approach to Explaining Negation: An Overview of the Materials Presented by Professor Hardarik Blühdorn in His
Vorlesung Negation: Syntax, Prosodie und Semantik at the Universität Mannheim during the Fall Semester of 2009

In the foregoing, we have seen among grammars for advanced learners of German significant evidence that there is as yet no scholarly consensus on certain matters of negation, such as the negation of sentences where there is a degree of lexicalization in a noun-verb collocation, e.g. Tennis spielen, in utterances involving *PRÄPOSITIONALOBJEKTE*, such as Das Kind bedankte sich für die Schokolade, and finally in highly lexicalized collocations involving a relatively limited class of verbs in *FUNKTIONSVORBEGEFÜGE*. In this excursus, I will briefly examine a new approach to the topic of negation to see how much promise it holds for some of the problems facing advanced learners of German seeking a full command of negation.

The many rules outlined for negation result in part from the need to address a wide audience of non-native speakers whose knowledge of their own native languages will lead them to unresolved questions. References for native-English speaking learners tend to simplify the rules, perhaps in order to avoid problematic concepts, such as *PHRASAL VERBS*, and perhaps also, based on the assumption that the readers understand that the L1 and L2 follow the same rule in enough instances that reliance on skill transference is regarded as a plus. Nevertheless, the high number of detailed rules still cannot address every example of *nicht* and *kein* for DaF-learners, calling into question the general approach for explaining negation. Perhaps simpler rules exist. The following section will provide a brief look at a different approach presented at the Universität Mannheim during the Fall semester of 2007.

The so-called *Büchlein* distributed by Professor Hardarik Blühdorn in his lecture *Negation: Syntax, Prosodie und Semantik* 90 provides a lengthier explanation of negation in comparison with those found in the grammar references analyzed.⁸⁴ Professor Blühdorn bases his arguments in both the information found in Duden, the IDS-Grammatik, and current articles in the same field, as well as in data collected for analysis by the INSTITUT FÜR DEUTSCHE SPRACHE. In contrast to the other grammars, he argues that a basic understanding of sentence structure must begin with restructuring a given sentence into a V-letzt pattern, as this structure does not contain *KONTINUITÄTSBRÜCHE*. His primary example, *Maria hat den Kindern gestern das Frühstück in die Schule gebracht* changes then to ..., *dass Maria den Kindern gestern das Frühstück in die Schule gebracht hat*.⁸⁵ Next, he emphasizes the importance of identifying the *KONSTITUENTE*⁸⁶, which he defines as “ein syntaktisch zusammenhängender Ausdruck..., der Teil eines größeren syntaktisch zusammenhängenden Ausdrucks ist. Die größte syntaktische Konstituente ist der Satz, die kleinste das Morphem“

⁸⁴ Professor Blühdorn is in the process of publishing a fuller account of his approach, but this book was not yet published while this thesis was being written and the conclusions drawn here are of course subject to reanalysis when his full account becomes available.

⁸⁵ Blühdorn, Hardarik, Negation: Syntax, Prosodie und Semantik (Vorlesung an der Universität Mannheim. Herbstsemester 2007) 18.

⁷ *Konsituente* can consist of any number of Satzglieder as long as they can stand in Vorfeld. (Wöllstein-Leisten, Heilmann, Stepan, and Vikner, 11-18.)

⁸Blühdorn, 64-65, 75 .

⁹Blühdorn, 70-72

¹⁰Blühdorn, 122-130.

(Blühorn 16). Understanding that all *KONSTITUENTEN* are comprised of into two parts plays an important role in understanding 91 the following illustration, which later aids in understanding his rules for negation:


(a) ..., (dass) [Maria [[den Kindern [gestern [das Frühstück [in die Schule [gebracht]]]]]] hat]] (18)

First, a simpler example exhibits the binary quality of a *KONSTITUENTE* more clearly than the example shown above.


(b) der alte Mann schnarcht (16)

This simple sentence can divide into several pairs, such as *der alte*, *alte Mann*, *Mann schnarcht*, but only *alte Mann* constitutes a *KONSTITUENTE*.


(c) [alte Mann]



(d) [der [alte Mann]]



(e) [der [alte Mann]] schnarcht



Because *schmarcht* requires a complete *NOMINALPHRASE* to form the next higher order *KONSTITUENTE*, in this case, a sentence, 92 examples (c) through (e) demonstrate how each pair forms another pair, until *der alte Mann schmarcht* consists of an NP and a verb. The *NOMINALPHRASE* resolves into *der* and *alte Mann*, which is further resolvable into *alte* and *Mann*. With this in mind, the *KONSTITUENTENSTRUKTUR* of example (a) breaks down in the following manner. Notice how with each successive phrase, an additional bracket appears to the right of *gebracht*:

(f) [in die Schule[gebracht]]

(g) [das Frühstück [in die Schule [gebracht]]]

(h) [gestern [das Frühstück [in die Schule [gebracht]]]]

(i) [den Kindern [gestern [das Frühstück [in die Schule [gebracht]]]]]

By this point, *gebracht* does not receive a further bracket to its right. Rather, *hat* forms the next *KONSTITUENTE* with *den Kindern gestern das Frühstück in die Schule gebracht*, which explains the additional bracket to the left of *den Kindern*.

(j) [[den Kindern [gestern [das Frühstück [in die Schule [gebracht]]]]] hat]

Now, the subject, *Maria*, forms the final *KONSTITUENTE*, namely, the sentence.

(k)..., (dass) [Maria [[den Kindern [gestern [das Frühstück [in die Schule [gebracht]]]]] hat]]

By identifying these boundaries, the reader can then identify the proper placement of *nicht*, namely, immediately before a

KONSTITUENTE.⁸⁷

(l) Ø [ØMaria Ø [Ø [Øden Kindern Ø [Øgestern Ø [Ø das Frühstück Ø [Ø in die Schule [Ø gebracht]]]]]]

Ø hat]] (28)

The Ø placed immediately **following** the left bracket of a phrase indicates *SONDERNEGATION* of only that phrase. For example,

nicht in die Schule, nicht das Frühstück, nicht gestern. A Ø standing directly **before** a left bracket also indicates

SONDERNEGATION, but of a larger *KONSTITUENTE*. For example, *nicht in die Schule gebracht, nicht das Frühstück in die Schule gebracht*.⁸⁸

Example (l) shows with which *KONSTITUENTE nicht* can form a more complex *KONSTITUENTE*. Due to this rule, *nicht* cannot stand alone in the *VORFELD*.⁸⁹ According to this, *nicht* could interact with the example as follows:

(o) ..., dass [**nicht Maria**]den Kindern gestern das Frühstück in die Schule gebracht hat. =

[ØMaria [[den Kindern [gestern [das Frühstück [in die Schule [gebracht]]]]]] hat]]

(p) ..., dass **nicht [Maria den Kindern gestern das Frühstück in die Schule gebracht hat]**

⁸⁷ Blühdorn 16.

⁸⁸ By showing the different positions for *nicht*, Blühdorn helps demonstrate a remark by Duden that the use of *sondern* can occur in cases of *SATZNEGATION* as well.

⁸⁹ Blühdorn 30.

Ø [Maria [[den Kindern [gestern [das Frühstück [in die Schule [gebracht]]]]]] hat]]

After having established the possible positions for *nicht* in a V-*letzt* sentence that does not contain any *SYNTAKTISCHE DISKONTINUITÄTEN*, the sentence can return to a V-*zweit* pattern using *t*, an abbreviation for *TRACE*, to signify the movement of the finite verb and the subject to the *LINKE SATZKLAMMER* and the *VORFELD*, respectively.⁹⁰ *t1* refers to *hat*, *t2* to *Maria*.⁹¹

(q) [hat] [Maria [[den Kindern [gestern [das Frühstück [in die Schule [gebracht]]]]]] *t1*]]

(r) [Maria] [hat] [*t2* [[den Kindern [gestern [das Frühstück [in die Schule [gebracht]]]]]] *t1*]]

Example (p) raises an important point about *SYNTAKTISCHE DISKONTINUITÄTEN*. Although *nicht* can precede all of the elements in the subordinate clause, once *Maria* moves to the *VORFELD*, *nicht* can only negate *Maria* because *Maria* and *hat* do not form a *KONSTITUENTE*.⁹² The possible positions for *nicht* do not move with *Maria* or *hat*, but remain in their original positions. (see example (l)) The correct negation for example (p) can still occur with *Maria* in the *VORFELD*, however, a special intonation pattern must accompany this sentence structure.

To differentiate between negating a *SATZGLIED* directly following the negator and negating a *SATZGLIED* standing in a different field of the sentence, German uses a *BRÜCKENKONTUR*. The *BRÜCKENKONTUR* signifies an intonation pattern which consists of the *NEGIERTER AUSDRUCK* receiving the rising accent and the *NEGATIONSAUSDRUCK* receiving the falling.

⁹⁰ Blühdorn 29.

⁹¹ Blühdorn 25.

⁹² Blühdorn 30.

(r) [Maria] [hat] [**nicht** t2 [den Kindern[gestern[**das** Frühstück [in die Schule [gebracht]]]]]] t1]] corresponds with (s)

(s) /MaRIa hat NICHT\ den Kindern gestern das Frühstück in die Schule gebracht.

The explanations relating to the placement of *nicht* provide more detail on the possibilities available for *SONDERNEGATION*, but do not discuss the rules of *SATZNEGATION*. By understanding the boundaries for each *KONSTITUENTE*, the reader has a better idea of the scope of *nicht*, which Duden focuses on more so than the other grammars. The lack of rules in this source available for a non-native speaker prove a disadvantage to using this approach in a foreign language classroom, but only when learning *SATZNEGATION*.

In addition to discussing *nicht* within a syntactical framework, Blühdorn devotes a section for rules on when and how to use *nicht* or *kein*. He explains that “Zähl-Substantive im Singular mit *ein* [...], Zählsubstantive im Plural ohne Artikel [...] [und] Masse-Substantive im Singular ohne Artikel “ (Blühdorn, 12-13) require *kein*. However, in contrast to the other grammars, he also distinguishes between *REFERENTIELLE* and *NICHT-REFERENTIELLE INDEFINITA*. *REFERENTIELLE INDEFINITA* include “Gegenstände, Sachverhalte oder Relationen, die Sprecher und Hörer sich als Bestandteile der Welt denken.” For example, *Ein Passagier kam herein*. According to the author, the reader should imagine „einen bestimmten Passagier..., von dessen Hereinkommen berichtet wird.” *NICHT-REFERENTIELLE INDEFINITA* do not and cannot produce the „Vorstellung eines Referenten.“ For example, *Ich suche eine neue Wohnung* (50). Blühdorn contends that „es bleibt offen, ob überhaupt ein Objekt gefunden wird, auf

das die Beschreibung passt.“ Only *NICHT-REFERENTIELLE INDEFINITA*⁹³ can use *kein*.⁹⁴ For example, *Ich suche keine neue Wohnung* (51). Using *kein* with *REFERENTIELLE INDEFINITA*, in contrast, changes them into *NICHT-REFERENTIELLE INDEFINITA*. For example, *Ein Passagier kam nicht herein* versus *Kein Passagier kam herein* (52). The former continues to indicate a particular person, while the latter, changes the meaning from a particular person to a general, non-referential category. In comparison to the explanations found in other sources, a non-native speaker might benefit more from his rules regarding the types of *INDEFINITA* in addition to simple rules, such as *kein* negates an indefinite article or a *NULLARTIKEL*.

The second portion of Blühorn's presentation of negation consists of chapters on prosody. It also uses the principles he set forth in the chapters on syntax, extended by nine basic intonation patterns for negation in German. Though the intonation of a sentence can allow for negation despite *SYNTAKTISCHE DISKONTINUITÄTEN*, the reader must always keep the rules of syntax in mind to identify the negated part of speech correctly.⁹⁵ According to Blühorn, three principles comprise the *WOHLGEFORMTHEITSBEDINGUNGEN*. First, every *INTONATIONSPHRASE* must include a *NUKLEARAKZENT (FALLENDER*

⁹³ The other grammars make a point of mentioning the use of *kein* with phrases such as “Er ist keine Schlafmütze.” Blühorn's explanation for *kein* using the terms *REFERENTIELLE* and *NICHT-REFERENTIELLE INDEFINITA* covers this phrase without the need to add an additional rule. “...die Nominalphrase *eine Schlafmütze* bringt keinen zweiten Referenten ins Spiel, sondern ordnet dem Referenten von *Otto* eine Beschreibung zu...Die Nominalphrase *eine Schlafmütze* ist nicht-referentiell“ (50). He later explains that the use of *kein* with any *NICHT-REFERENTIELLE INDEFINITA* does not change their meaning, whereas *REFERENTIELLE INDEFINITA* negated with *kein* become *NICHT-REFERENTIELL*.(51)

⁹⁴ Blühorn, 51.

⁹⁵ Blühorn, 42.

AKZENT). Secondly, the *NUKLEARAKZENT* divides the *ÄUßERUNG* into a *PRÄNUKLEAREN BEREICH*, to which „ fakultativ 97 einer oder mehrere steigenden Akzente zugewiesen werden [können]“ and a *POSTNUKLEAREN BEREICH*, to ” keine Akzente zugewiesen werden [können]“ (75). (H) indicates *HOCHTON*, or rather, the *STEIGENDER AKZENT*; (L) indicates *TIEFTON*, namely, the *NUKLEARAKZENT*. The *FOKUS* of the *ÄUßERUNG*, which serves as the basis for understanding German prosody, is the *KONSTITUENTE* receiving the falling accent. The *FOKUSAKZENT* corresponds to the falling accent which each *ÄUßERUNG* in German must contain. Again, syntax dictates how far the *FOKUS* can continue: “Vom Fokusexponenten⁹⁶ aus kann sich der Fokus so weit ausbreiten, wie syntaktische Kontinuität besteht“ (72)The *TOPIK*, by contrast, receives the rising accent.⁹⁷

Finally, Blühdorn introduces the use of semantics, indivisible from syntax and prosody for the interpretation of negation. Just as the preceding explanations for syntax and prosody included detailed background information and examples, the explanation for semantics also covers a wide array of factors. Beginning with the basic rules of logic, Blühdorn uses the *ALL-QUANTOR*, meaning *alle*, and the *EXISTENZ-QUANTOR*, meaning *einige*, as his starting point for explaining the logic behind statements. The following sentences give an example of the sentences he uses.

(a) Alle Anwesenden rauchen nicht = Es gibt keine Anwesenden, die rauchen.

(b) Nicht alle Anwesenden rauchen. = Einige Anwesenden rauchen nicht.

⁹⁶ “die Silbe, auf die der Fokusakzent fällt” (72).

⁹⁷ Blühdorn 68-78.

He also defines sentences in terms of the *BESCHRIEBENER SACHVERHALT, DIE PROPOSITION, DER EPISTEMISCHE KONTEXT, DER SPRECHAKT, and DAS HANDLUNGSKONTEXT*.⁹⁸ In other words, (d,A (e,P (t,S))). For example, *vielleicht (nicht (passen zusammen (wir)))* (124). From this detailed argument, the main factor in understanding and using negation correctly is in understanding the context, and primarily, understanding if negation can occur logically in a given context. Gleaned from this, understanding the difference between negating a *SACHVERHALT* and a *PROPOSITION* stands at the core of his proposal. “Sachverhalte können in einem bestimmten zeitlichen Kontext der Fall sein oder nicht der Fall sein, aber sie können weder wahr noch falsch sein“ (127). According to this definition, modifying a statement with *meines Wissens*, or *nach allem, was mir bekannt ist* would correspond to a *PROPOSITION*⁹⁹, and *Es ist der Fall* to a *SACHVERHALT*.

- (a) *Meines Wissens hat Maria den Kindern gestern das Frühstück in die Schule gebracht.*
- (b) *Es ist der Fall, dass Maria den Kindern gestern das Frühstück in die Schule gebracht hat.*

The phrase *Es ist wahr* could also modify example (a). Because Blühdorn does not provide sufficient definitions or examples for how to apply these principles to negation, a native English speaking learner would benefit primarily from understanding the shared logic that underlies negation in both English and German.

⁹⁸ Blühdorn 130.

⁹⁹ „Propositionen werden in einer bestimmten epistemischen Modalität und mit zugeordnete Wahrheitswerten für bestimmte epistemische Kontext zum Zwecke der Ausführung von Sprechakten geäußert. Sprechakte sind Handlungen von Sprechern gegenüber Adressaten, die aufgrund bestimmter Handlungsmotive und mit bestimmten Handlungszielen im Kontext von Handlungsplänen und sozialen Wertesystemen ausgeführt werden“ (129).

The purpose of introducing Professor Blühdorn's approach to negation relates to the need to find a simpler presentation for 99 grammar rules relating to the use of *nicht* and *kein*. Duden's taxonomy for negation features the simplest approach, but does not help non-native speakers understand when to use *nicht* or *kein*, nor where to place *nicht*. The other grammars provide detailed rules which require knowledge of word order patterns in the *MITTELFELD* in addition to the *VALENZ* of the verb. Blühdorn, instead, focuses on all possible places for *nicht* to stand, which requires that the reader be able to recognize the correct word order for *NEBENSÄTZE*. The other grammars' rules differentiate between *SATZ-* and *SONDERNEGATION*, but do not delve into the complexity of the scope of *nicht*. The explanation for the use of *kein* also highlights another advantage of Professor Blühdorn's approach. Other explanations categorize the usage based on the appearance of an indefinite article or a *NULLARTIKEL*, as well as instances where *nicht ein* occurs to indicate a *ZAHLADJEKTIV*. Both explanations serve learners well, but the added insight about *REFERENTIELL* or *NICHT-REFERENTIELL* would help authors avoid writing rules about special usages, such as *Er ist keine Schlafmütze*, that prove superfluous when considering that *Schlafmütze* does not refer to a particular item, but rather to a category of behavior¹⁰⁰.

Disadvantages do appear in both of these explanations, however, which highlight the shortcomings of the examples. For example, identifying the *KONSTITUENTENSTRUKTUR* would not help a learner realize cases where *nicht* has to follow a particular *SATZGLIED*, such a dative or accusative object, in order to negate the entire sentence. Similarly, cases where only *SONDERNEGATION* can occur, such as with *MODALANGABE*, would not reveal themselves simply by segmenting the parts of the

¹⁰⁰ Helbig/Buscha gives a rule for a similar case, which Blühdorn's example nullifies: "*kein* als Artikelwort kann in den meisten Fällen nicht wegfallen, ohne dass der Satz ungrammatisch wird: Werner ist *kein* Faulpelz. →*Werner ist Faulpelz" (555-6).

sentence. The learner would need to rely on the specific syntax rules to negate the sentence correctly. In reference to the rules on 100 *kein*, Blühdorn does not address a problematic case for native speakers of English, namely, *Er ist Anwalt*. Using the rules of *NICHT-REFERENTIELL* and *REFERENTIELL* do not lend themselves well to this problem, as readers could reason that *Anwalt* refers to *er*, therefore exhibiting *REFERENTIELL* qualities, thus *Er ist nicht Anwalt* negates only the profession. *Er is kein Anwalt*, which would negate the qualities or behaviors peculiar to the profession, does not correspond well with the definition given, as *Anwalt* still appears to refer to the subject in the same manner. The section on prosody provides a wealth of information not found in any of the grammars. Due to the number of rules given, perhaps authors could use this source to choose the most helpful rules for their audience. The application of these rules by learners would not succeed, however, if the authors do not supplement the book with audio-materials. Last, the section on semantics, though useful for linguistics studies, would introduce information that does not necessarily cause a problem for students, at least not those that speak English natively, as many of the points mentioned do not differ from their English equivalents. As a source used independently of other references, Professor Blühdorn's approach to negation would prove more confusing for learners than helpful due to its complexity and lack of sufficient examples.

The difficulty non-native speakers of German experience in correctly negating entire sentences arises from two main issues: the native language of the student and their understanding of the prescriptive rules provided for using *nicht* and *kein*. The clarity of the rules in turn depends both on the authors' terminology and explanations and on the readers' background in grammar, all of which depend on yet more circumstances. This thesis provided the evidence that neither Hammer, nor Helbig/Buscha, nor Hall/Scheiner use key terms consistently that underlie understanding the syntax of negation. Other inconsistencies across the sources include the formulation of rules; the explanation of the verbal and non-verbal components of the *PRÄDIKAT*; and the role given to intonation.

Knowing the difficulty of mastering negation rules, authors targeting this multi-lingual audience attempt to present negation with the clearest formulas in order to help DaF-learners increase their passive and active knowledge of the usages of *nicht* and *kein* that indicate *SATZNEGATION*. Despite this common goal and wide-ranging commonality in the sentence types they address, grammars rarely state the same number of rules, much less formulate them in the same way. Though knowing that one grammar presented a list of rules so indisputably correct and easily applicable would save teachers and learners time looking for answers, the more pressing question remains: do these grammars provide the same rules formatted differently? This question leads to the question of whether and how they contradict each other, and if they do not, whether the lack of detail in one or the abundance in another would still lead readers to the incorrect answer.

In an attempt to answer these questions, this thesis looked at several sources. First, A.E. Hammer's *German Grammar and Usage* served as the example representative of an intermediate grammar used by native English speaking university students in North

America. Gerhard Helbig and Joachim Buscha's *Deutsche Grammatik: Ein Handbuch für den Ausländerunterricht* represented an 103 intermediate to advanced grammar addressing a multi-lingual audience both as a general reference and as a source of practice accompanying classwork. *Übungsgrammatik: Deutsch als Fremdsprache für Fortgeschrittene* by Karin Hall and Barbara Scheiner also represented an intermediate grammar found in Germany, but aimed specifically at grammar problems that frequently arise with students preparing for a proficiency exam or for studies at a German university. Finally, *Duden: die Grammatik* served both as the example of an advanced explanation typically used at German universities and as the main source for each of the three grammars.

The analysis followed several steps to answer the main questions proposed in the introduction. First, Chapter 2 emphasized the importance of identifying the intended audience of each book by showing that Hammer focused on learners with a specific native language, English, whereas Hall-Scheiner and Helbig-Buscha addressed an audience of learners with a far wider spectrum of native languages, though it appears likely that the spectrum differs slightly for each of these books. The Duden grammar, finally, addresses native (and near-native) speakers with a view to codifying observed linguistic usage so as to facilitate clarity of expression.

Next, Chapter 3 found that each source used the same concepts, but applied them to negation rules inconsistently, which reflected the authors' expectations of their audience. For example, Hammer formulated rules assuming that readers already knew the meaning of *VALENZ* and *VERB COMPLEMENT*, while Helbig/Buscha provided an abundance of detail in each rule to compensate for the readers' lack of familiarity with grammar.

Chapter 4 found in its analyses of example sentences that, regardless of the degree of detail explaining the rules found in each source, some of Hammer's rules would lead to errors, as was the case with the negation of adverbs. Furthermore, none of the authors

sufficiently explained nouns acting as non-verbal components in the *PRÄDIKAT*. These rules, filled with erratically used terminology sometimes indicating *FUNKTIONSVORBEGEFÜGE*, sometimes *LEXIKALISCHE PRÄDIKATSTEILE*, and sometimes simply collocations, did not provide clear guidelines for when to use *nicht* vs. *kein*. Non-native speakers unaware of the continuous development of collocations into nouns that complete the meaning of the finite verb need a clearer explanation of this concept before they can understand the negation rules that apply to them. With the exception of these problems, the grammars' rules overlap to a large extent.

Acting as an extension to the main analysis, Chapter 5 showed that a beginner's level textbook, such as *Kontakte*, does not prepare students to understand the negation rules found in these intermediate grammars. First, the authors avoid addressing negation by presenting rules that rely heavily on the semantics of the word *not* in the L1. In cases where this similarity between the L1 and the L2 did not suffice, the authors gave learners negated adjective and adverbial phrases to use as such. Secondly, the grammar pages serve to support communicative learning, not to increase learners' declarative knowledge of grammar. Without the necessary terms and concepts, learners transitioning to the intermediate level must first learn the terms and concepts. The few concepts they could transfer, such as subject, object, declensions, conjugations, and the basic sentence structure patterns could not compensate for the remaining definitions they would not have obtained from *Kontakte*.

Finally, Chapter 6 presented a brief overview of new research from Professor Hardarick Blühdorn of the INSTITUT FÜR DEUTSCHE SPRACHE. During the Fall of 2007, he lectured on the topic *Negation: Syntax, Prosodie und Semantik* at the Universität Mannheim, presenting a different approach to the understanding of negation. By considering a different approach, the analysis sought

to find a simpler, more easily applicable series of questions that could help non-native speakers find the correct placement of *nicht* 105 or determine when to *nicht* or *kein* without the need for explicit rules formulated in terms of *SATZGLIEDER*. Unfortunately, both the level of complexity and focus of this source led to the conclusion that intermediate learners would not benefit from this approach.

The initial questions found in the introduction have yielded the question of how to improve what the grammar books provide students. One solution would require that the authors use a common approach that does not distribute the overall topic over more than chapter. Next, the explanations for the *PRÄDIKAT* need further clarification of the nouns acting as non-verbal components, especially in terms of when to use *nicht* vs. *kein*. Though Helbig/Buscha's distinguishing between *FUNKTIONSVERBGEFÜGE* and *LEXIKALISCHE PRÄDIKATSTEILE* highlights these differences better than Hammer and Hall/Scheiner, perhaps the authors should indicate the correct negator for each verbal phrase found in their lists. Finally, it is evident that the role of intonation in negation plays a crucial and understudied role in negation. Because the intonation used can reveal as much about the meaning of an utterance as the word order can, DaF-learners need to understand the importance of this information. More importantly, writers of grammars, both at the beginning level and at the more advanced level, need to establish an agreed upon understanding of the role of intonation in negation and incorporate this information into their works. As these improvements will not occur immediately, teachers addressing the topic of negation as part of a class should approach each source's explanations critically, relying finally on the opinion of a native speaker as a way to test the validity of the rules.

Works Cited

- Brandl, Klaus. Communicative Language Teaching in Action: Putting Principles to Work. Upper Saddle River: Pearson Prentice Hall, 2008.
- DeKeyser, Robert M., ed. Practice in a Second Language: Perspectives from Applied Linguistics and Cognitive Psychology. The Cambridge Applied Linguistics Series. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 2007.
- Durrell, Martin, Katrin Kohl, and Gudrun Loftus. Practicing German Grammar: A Workbook for Use with *Hammer's German Grammar and Usage*. 2nd ed. Lincolnwood: NTC Publishing Group, 1997.
- Hall, Karin, and Barbara Scheiner. Übungsgrammatik: Deutsch als Fremdsprache für Fortgeschrittene. Ismaning: Max Hueber Verlag, 2001.
- Hammer, A.E. Hammer's German Grammar and Usage. 1971. Ed. Martin Durrell. 2nd ed. New York: Edward Arnold, 1991.

Helbig, Gerhard, and Helbig Buscha. Deutsche Grammatik: Ein Handbuch für den Ausländerunterricht. Berlin: Langenscheidt KG, 2001.

Helbig, Gerhard, and Helbig Buscha. Übungsgrammatik Deutsch. Berlin: Langenscheidt KG, 2000.

Kunkel-Razum, Kathrin, and Franziska Münzberg, eds. Duden: die Grammatik. 7th ed. Duden 4. Mannheim: Bibliographisches Institut & F.A. Brockhaus AG, 2006.


Muranoi, Hitoshi. "Output Practice in the L2 Classroom." DeKeyser, 51-84.

Nation, I.S.P. Vocabulary in Another Language. The Cambridge Applied Linguistics Series. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 2001.

Politzer, Robert L. Teaching German: A Linguistic Orientation. Waltham: Blaisdell, 1968.

Tschirner, Erwin, Brigitte Nikolai, and Tracy D. Terrell. Kontakte: A Communicative Approach. 6th ed. Boston: McGraw-Hall, 2008.

Appendix A



(879)

	Helbig/Busch	Hammer	Hall/Scheiner	Duden
	<i>Negationsklammer</i>			
1. <i>nicht</i>	„strebt nach dem Ende des Satzes...bildet zusammen mit dem finiten Verb eine Negationsklammer., (549).	∅	„tendiert zum Satzende;“ Finitum + <i>nicht</i> = „Negationsklammer“ (305)	In V2-Sätzen: „[steht]im Mittelfeld und kann auf diese Weise ganz ans Satzende rücken“ (par. 1432).
	„Er <i>besuchte</i> seinen alten Freund trotz der engen Bindungen <i>nicht</i> “ (549).		„Heute klappt die Organisation nicht “ (305). „Man hat ihnen die Anstrengungen der Reise nicht angesehen “ (305).	„Verbletztsatz: (Ich hoffe,...) dass [Anna] [das Buch] <i>nicht</i> liest. Verbzweitsatz: [Anna] liest [das Buch] <i>nicht</i> “ (par. 1432).
	<i>Satznegation: Einteiliges Prädikat</i>			
2. <i>nicht</i>	∅ (see 1a, 4a)	∅	„steht...nach...Pronomen bei einteiligem Prädikat am Satzende...“ (305).	∅ (see 1d)
			„Heute klappt sie nicht “ (305).	
3. <i>nicht</i>	∅ (see 1a, 4a)	∅	„steht...nach Subjekten ...mit bestimmten Artikel...bei einteiligem Prädikat am Satzende...“ (305).	∅ (see 1d)
			„Heute klappt die Organisation nicht “ (305).	
	<i>Satznegation: Mehrteiliges Prädikat</i>			
4. <i>nicht</i>	cannot stand outside of the <i>Verbklammer</i> †“Bei den trennbaren	∅	„steht vor der infiniten Verbform (Infinitiv/Partizip II)...“ (305).	„Bei Sätzen mit komplexen Prädikaten steht <i>nicht</i> vor den

	Helbig/Busch	Hammer	Hall/Scheiner	Duden
	Verbteilen [fallen] die Satznegation mit der Sondernegation positionell zusammen...“ (549).			Prädikatsteilen der rechten Satzklammer...“ (par. 1432).
	„Er wird morgen <i>nicht</i> abreisen. Er ist gestern <i>nicht</i> abgereist. Er reist heute <i>nicht</i> ab“ (549). „Er steigt dort <i>nicht</i> aus , sondern ein “ (549).		„Die Touristen haben sich ihre Enttäuschung nicht anmerken lassen“ (305). „Man hat ihnen die Anstrengungen der Reise nicht angesehen“ (305).	„Verbletztsatz: (Ich glaube,...) dass Anna das Buch <i>nicht</i> lesen will. Verbzweitsatz: Anna will das Buch <i>nicht</i> lesen. Verbletztsatz: (Ich glaube,...) dass Anna das Buch <i>nicht</i> durchliest. Verbzweitsatz: Anna liest das Buch <i>nicht</i> durch. Verbletztsatz: (Ich glaube,...) dass Anna diesem Umstand <i>nicht</i> Rechnung trägt. Verbzweitsatz: Anna trägt diesem Umstand <i>nicht</i> Rechnung“ (par. 1432).
5. <i>nicht</i>	∅ (see 4a)	∅	„steht... vor...einer trennbaren Vorsilbe...“ (305)“	(see 4d)
			„Trotz des Regens fiel der Spaziergang durch den Schlosspark nicht aus“ (305).	
	Sondernegation			
6.	„steht...unmittelbar vor dem negierten Glied, das Wort oder	“If...applies to one particular element in	„wird [Negiertem] unmittelbar vorangestellt“ (307).	„Die Negationspartikel <i>nicht</i> steht am linken

	Helbig/Busch	Hammer	Hall/Scheiner	Duden
<i>nicht</i>	ein Satzglied, aber niemals das finite Verb sein kann,...[außer] wenn das negierte Glied durch starke Betonung (durch Akzent) hervorgehoben ist...“ (548).	the clause...then it precedes the element” (479) “ ‘partial’ negation” (479)		Rand ihres Fokus“ (par. 1431).
	„Er ist <i>nicht</i> aus-, sondern umgestiegen. Er fährt <i>nicht</i> mit der Straßenbahn, sondern mit dem Bus. Der Student hat <i>nicht</i> gut, sondern ausgezeichnet gearbeitet“ (548). „ Heute ist ihr Sohn nicht gekommen. (Sondernegation) Heute ist ihr Sohn nicht gekommen (Satznegation)“ (548).	Sie hat mir nicht das Buch gegeben (i.e. not the book, but something else) [...] Sie sind nicht am Freitag nach Teneriffa geflogen (i.e. not on Friday, but some other day) [...] Nicht mir hat er das Buch gegeben, sondern meiner Schwester“ (479).	„(1) Der Hotelier gab gestern Herrn Meier etwas, aber nicht die Zimmerrechnung (, sondern die Telefonrechnung). (2) Der Hotelier gab gestern nicht Herrn Meier (, sondern Herrn Huber) die Zimmerrechnung“ (307).	„Otto hat die Schere glücklicherweise <i>nicht in den Müll</i> geworfen (sondern <u>unter den Tisch</u>)“ (par 1431).
7. <i>nicht</i>	Wenn die Sondernegation nicht unmittelbar vor dem negierten Glied steht, erscheint sie meist—in „Kontraststellung“—am Ende des Satzes bzw. vor dem zweiten Teil des verbalen Rahmens...“ (548).	“may follow...place and direction complements if it is relatively unstressed and the complement itself is to be given prominence” (479)	∅	∅
	„ Fleißig arbeitet der Schüler <i>nicht</i> . Fleißig hat der Schüler <i>nicht</i> gearbeitet“ (549).	(no example given)		

	Helbig/Busch	Hammer	Hall/Scheiner	Duden
8. <i>nicht</i> <i>oder</i> <i>kein</i>	<p>„Präpositionalgruppen (<i>nicht</i> steht vor der Präposition, <i>kein</i> zwischen Präposition und Substantiv)...“ (555).</p> <p>†“In diesen Fällen ist die Verneinung mit <i>kein</i> seltener und immer als Sondernegation interpretierbar, während die Verneinung mit <i>nicht</i>...manchmal sowohl als Satz- wie als Sondernegation verstanden werden kann“ (555).</p>	<p>“In a few cases...with prepositional phrases...”(108-9).</p>	∅	∅
	<p>„Er geht auf ein Gymnasium. →Er geht <i>nicht</i> auf ein Gymnasium. →Er geht auf <i>kein</i> Gymnasium. Sie fährt zu einem Kuraufenthalt. →Sie fährt <i>nicht</i> zu einem Kuraufenthalt. →Sie fährt zu <i>keinem</i> Kuraufenthalt. Sie kommt aus einer großen Stadt. →Sie kommt <i>nicht</i> aus einer großen Stadt. →Sie kommt aus <i>keiner</i> großen Stadt“ (555).</p>	<p>“Sie geht in keine/nicht in eine Dorfschule[.] Ich fahre zu keinem/nicht zu einem Fest[.] Ich habe es mit keinem/nicht mit einem Bleistift geschrieben” (109).</p> <p>†<i>nicht</i>= “general” <i>kein</i> = “negat[es] only the following noun” (109). “<i>Sie geht in keine</i></p>		

	Helbig/Busch	Hammer	Hall/Scheiner	Duden
		<i>Dorfschule</i> has the sense of ‘It’s not a <u>village</u> school she’s going to’” (109).		
	Beschränkungen			
9. <i>nicht</i>	<p>[Sondernegation] „haben dieselben Positionen und Bezugsbereiche wie die Gradpartikeln...“ (547).</p> <p>† „[Partikeln] sind...nicht erststellenfähig“ (420). (see 9d)</p> <p>†“Die Stellung der Gradpartikel ergibt sich aus dem Bezugsglied: Zumeist steht sie unmittelbar vor dem Bezugsglied (Nur <i>der Arzt konnte ihm helfen.</i>), sie kann jedoch auch unmittelbar nach dem Bezugsglied (<i>Der Arzt nur konnte ihm helfen.</i>) und—noch seltener (nur bei starkem Akzent)—in Distanzstellung (<i>Der Arzt konnte dem Verletzten nur helfen.</i>) erscheinen“ (423). (compare 1a, 7a, 8a)</p>	∅	∅	„ <i>nicht</i> ...kann...nicht allein das Vorfeld besetzen...“ (par. 1435).
	<p>(a)“<i>Sogar</i> Christine hat Peter zum Geburtstag gratuliert.</p> <p>(b) Christine hat <i>sogar</i> Peter</p>			<p>„(a)*Nicht brachte Anna das Buch.</p> <p>Nicht [Anna] brachte das</p>

	Helbig/Busch	Hammer	Hall/Scheiner	Duden
	zum Geburtstag gratuliert. (c) Christine hat Peter <i>sogar</i> zum Geb <u>u</u> rtstag gratuliert“(422).			Buch (sondern Beate)“ (par.1435).
10. <i>nicht</i>	∅ (see 9a)	∅	∅	„Die Negation steht... nie zwischen Vorfeld und linker Satzklammer...“ (par. 1432).
				„*[Anna] <i>nicht</i> liest [das Buch]“ (par. 1432).
	<i>Vor einem unbestimmten Artikel</i>			
11. <i>kein</i>	„neg + <i>ein</i> → <i>kein</i> “ (546) (als unbestimmter Artikel) (553)	“the negative form of the indefinite article” (108)	„negiert Substantive mit unbestimmtem Artikel...“ (306).	<i>kein</i> = ein negativ- indefinites Artikelwort (par.1436)
	„Er isst <i>einen</i> Apfel. → Er ist <i>keinen</i> Apfel“ (546).	„Es war ein angenehmer Anblick. Es war kein angenehmer Anblick. Kennst du einen Arzt? Kennst du keinen Arzt“ (108)?	„Es steht eine Überraschung bevor. Es steht keine Überraschung bevor“(306).	„Es fehlt [<i>kein</i> Schräubchen]. → Es ist <i>nicht</i> der Fall, dass [<i>ein/irgendein</i> Schräubchen] fehlt“ (par.1438).
	<i>„Ein“ als Zahladjektiv</i>			
12. <i>nicht</i>	<i>nicht ein</i> → „eine Verstärkung der Negation“ (553) Hier gilt <i>ein</i> als „Zahladjektiv“ (553).	<i>nicht ein</i> to emphasize <i>ein</i> “not one single” (109)	<i>nicht ein</i> = „Zahlwort“ (306)	<i>nicht ein</i> → wenn man <i>ein</i> stärker betont (par. 1438)

	Helbig/Busch	Hammer	Hall/Scheiner	Duden
	„Er kann eine Ausnahme machen. → Er kann nicht eine Ausnahme machen“ (553).	“Nicht <u>ein</u> Junge wußte die Antwort“ (109) .	„Das Reiseunternehmen hat nicht einen Konkurrenten“ (306).	„Es fehlt <i>nicht</i> ein Schraubchen“ (par. 1438).
	<i>Nullartikel</i>			
13. <i>kein</i>	„neg + Nullartikel → <i>kein</i> “ (546)	“corresponding positive sentence...zero article...” (108).	„negiert Substantive...ohne Artikel...” (306).	Umschreibungsprobe mit <i>kein</i> →“artikellose Nominalphrasen oder solche mit dem Artikelwort <i>ein</i> (<i>irgendein</i>)...” (par. 1438).
	„Er isst Butter. →Er ist <i>keine</i> Butter“ (546).	“Wir haben frische Brötchen. Wir haben keine frischen Brötchen. Ich habe Geld. Ich habe kein Geld“ (108).	„(1) Der Reiseleiter gibt sich Mühe. Der Reiseleiter gibt sich keine Mühe. (2)Er macht gute Vorschläge. Er macht keine guten Vorschläge“(306).	„(a)Es fehlt [<i>kein</i> Schraubchen]. → Es ist <i>nicht</i> der Fall, dass [<i>ein/irgendein</i> Schraubchen] fehlt. (b)Es fehlen [<i>keine</i> Schraubchen]. →Es ist <i>nicht</i> der Fall, dass [Schraubchen] fehlen (c) Es fehlt [<i>kein</i> Material]. →Es ist <i>nicht</i> der Fall, dass [Material] fehlt“ (par. 1438).
14. <i>kein</i>	„[Nullartikel] im Pl, wenn im Sg der unbestimmte Artikel steht...” (553).	(see 13b)	(see 11c, 13c)	(see 11d)
	„Er hat Brüder. → Er hat <i>keine</i> Brüder.			

	Helbig/Busch	Hammer	Hall/Scheiner	Duden
	Er unternimmt Ferienreisen. →Er unternimmt <i>keine</i> Ferienreisen“ (553).			
15. <i>kein</i>	Nullartikel→“Stoffnamen im Singular, die eine unbestimmte Menge eines Stoffes bezeichnet...“ (554).	(see 13b)	(see 13c)	(see 13d)
	„Er trank Bier. →Er trank <i>kein</i> Bier“ (554).			
16. <i>kein</i>	Nullartikel→“bei Substantiven auf <i>-zeug, -werk</i> u.a....“ (554).	∅	∅	∅
	„Das Kind wünschte sich zum Geburtstag Spielzeug. →Das Kind wünschte sich zum Geburtstag <i>kein</i> Spielzeug“ (554).			
	Prädikative			
17. <i>nicht</i>	must precede <i>Prädikativ</i> if <i>Substantiv</i> or <i>Adjektiv</i> (549) „Satz- und Sondernegation [fallen] positionell zusammen; eine spezielle Sondernegation ist bei den...Kopulaverben nicht möglich“ (549).	“precedes verb complements...with the exception of the subject and the accusative and dative objects...” (478).	„steht...vor Prädikativen...“ (305).	„ <i>nicht</i> steht [meist]...vor [adverbialen und prädikativen Ergänzungen]...“ (925).
	„Er wird nicht Rechtsanwalt. -- *Er wird Rechtsanwalt nicht. Er wird nicht krank.--*Er wird krank nicht“ (549).	„Sie sind gestern nicht nach Aalen gefahren. [...] Sie legte das Buch nicht auf den Tisch.	„Unser Reiseleiter, der nicht der beliebteste Reiseleiter zu sein scheint, gilt nicht als Experte. Er ist nicht geschwätzig. Er ist nicht hier“ (305).	„(a) Die Goldkette befand sich <i>nicht</i> [im Tresor]. Otto hat das Buch <i>nicht</i> [auf den Tisch] gelegt.

	Helbig/Busch	Hammer	Hall/Scheiner	Duden
		[...] Wir konnten uns nicht an diesen Vorfall erinnern. [...] Er blieb nicht in Rostock. [...] Sie ist sicher nicht dumm. [...] Sie war heute nicht im Büro [...]“ (478-9).	†Compare: 23a.	Die Gäste haben sich leider <i>nicht</i> [anständig] bekommen. (b) Der Gärtner war <i>nicht</i> der Mörder. Zum Glück bin ich <i>nicht</i> [krank] geworden“ (par. 1433).
18. <i>nicht</i>	∅	∅	„vor artikellosen Prädikativen in Form von Eigennamen u Tages- u Jahreszeiten“ (307).	∅
			„(2) Der Reiseleiter heißt nicht Jacques, oder doch? (3) Es wird noch lange nicht Herbst“ (307).	
19. <i>nicht</i>	can precede or follow <i>Prädikativ</i> if <i>Adverb</i> (550)	∅	∅ (see 17c)	(see 17d)
	„Er ist nicht dort. (Satz- or Sondernnegation) Er ist dort nicht (Satznegation)“ (550).			
20. <i>nicht</i>	cannot follow <i>Objektsprädikative</i> (550).	∅	∅ (see 17c)	(see 17d)
	„Sie nennt ihn nicht <i>fleißig</i> “ (550).			
21.	Substantiv = „Beruf, Nationalität, Funktion,	“If <i>ein</i> would be used in the positive	∅ (see 13c, 14c)	∅

	Helbig/Busch	Hammer	Hall/Scheiner	Duden
<i>kein</i>	Weltanschauung oder eines Titels mit Nullartikel im Prädikativum...“ (556).	sentence [with <i>sein</i> or <i>werden</i>]” (109).		
	„Er ist kein Lehrer.—Er ist Lehrer. Er ist kein Engländer.—Er ist Engländer. Er ist kein Christ.—Er ist Christ. Er ist kein Professor.—Er ist Professor“ (556).	„Er ist ein Schauspieler [.]Er ist kein Schauspieler“ (109).		
22. <i>nicht</i> <i>oder</i> <i>kein</i>	„Nominativ/ <i>es</i> + <i>sein/werden</i> + Nominativ (im nicht-verneinten Satz Nullartikel)...“ (555).	with <i>sein</i> or <i>werden</i> (109)	∅ (see 13c, 14c, 17c)	∅
	„Er ist (wird) Anwalt. →Er ist (wird) <i>nicht</i> Anwalt. →Er ist (wird) <i>kein</i> Anwalt. Es ist (wird) Sommer. →Es ist (wird) noch <i>nicht</i> Sommer. →Es ist (wird) noch <i>kein</i> Sommer“ (555).	„Er ist/wird kein/nicht Lehrer[.] Er ist/wird noch kein/nicht Sommer“ (109).		
23. <i>nicht</i>	Nullartikel→“bei Berufsbezeichnungen nach einem Verb + <i>als</i> ...“ (555).	∅	∅ (see 17c)	„ in Konjunkionalphrasen mit <i>als</i> ...“ (par. 1438).
	„Sie arbeitet als Therapeutin. →Sie arbeitet <i>nicht</i> als Therapeutin.			„Ich sage das nicht als Arzt. (*Ich sage das als kein

	Helbig/Busch	Hammer	Hall/Scheiner	Duden
	Er wurde als Trainer bestätigt. →Er wurde <i>nicht</i> als Trainer bestätigt“ (555).			Arzt.) Sie arbeitet nicht als Psychologin. (*Sie arbeitet als keine Psychologin.) (par. 1438).
	<i>Valenz-gebundene Glieder</i>			
24. <i>nicht</i>	[Satz- und Sondernegation] cannot follow „durch Valenz an das Verb gebundene Glieder (obligatorisch oder fakultative Aktanten)...“(550). „Satz- und Sondernegation der Adverbialbestimmung fallen...positionell zusammen“ (550).	†Rule 17b: „precedes verb complements...with the exception of the subject and the accusative and dative objects...“ (478).	„immer vor adverbialen Ergänzungen...“ (309).	(see 17c)
	„Er legt das Buch nicht <i>auf den Tisch</i> . *Er legt das Buch auf den Tisch nicht. Die Konferenz dauerte nicht <i>den ganzen Tag</i> . *Die Konferenz dauerte den ganzen Tag nicht. Er wohnt nicht <i>in Berlin</i> . *Er wohnt in Berlin nicht“ (550)	†Example 17b: „Sie sind gestern nicht nach Aalen gefahren. [...] Sie legte das Buch nicht auf den Tisch. [...] Wir konnten uns nicht an diesen Vorfall erinnern. [...] Er blieb nicht in Rostock. [...] Sie ist sicher nicht dumm. [...] Sie war heute nicht	„ (5)Die Stadtführung dauerte nicht den ganzen Tag. (6) Der Reiseleiter stammt nicht aus Paris“ (309).	

	Helbig/Busch	Hammer	Hall/Scheiner	Duden
		im Büro [...]“ (478-9).		
	<i>Kasusobjekte</i>			
25. <i>nicht</i>	„steht...nach Kasusobjekten...“ (550).	„follows any noun objects...“ (478).	„steht...nach...Dativ- und Akkobjekten mit bestimmten Artikel...bei einteiligem Prädikat am Satzende...“(305)	∅
	„Er findet das Buch <i>nicht</i> “ (550).	„Er hat seinen Zweck nicht erwähnt [...] Er hat mir das Buch nicht gegeben [...] Verkaufe die Bücher nicht! [...] Ich weiß, daß sie ihren Bruder gestern nicht gesehen hat“ (478).	(no example given)	
26. <i>nicht</i>	kann vor Kasusobjekten stehen, „wenn der Umfang der Objekte größer ist...“ (550).	∅	∅	∅
	„(a)Er berücksichtigte den psychischen Zustand des Kranken <i>nicht</i> . (b)Er berücksichtigte <i>nicht</i> den psychischen Zustand des Kranken. Im Fall (b) fallen Satz- und Sondernegation zusammen; die Satznegation wird durch Intonation und/oder			

	Helbig/Busch	Hammer	Hall/Scheiner	Duden
	Kontrastivität zur Sondernegation“ (550).			
27. <i>nicht</i>	∅	∅	„steht...meist vor Genitivobjekten...“ (305).	∅
			„Die Besichtigung des Schlosses bedurfte nicht der Zustimmung des Besitzers“ (305).	
	<i>Präpositionalobjekte</i>			
28. <i>nicht</i>	„vor [oder] nach Präpositionalobjekten...“ (551).	†Rule 17b: „precedes verb complements...with the exception of the subject and the accusative and dative objects...“ (478).	„steht...meist vor Präpositionalobjekten...“ (305).	∅
	„Er zweifelt <i>nicht</i> an seinen Vorhaben.—Er zweifelt an seinem Vorhaben <i>nicht</i> . Er erinnert sich <i>nicht</i> an mich.—Er erinnert sich an mich <i>nicht</i> “ (551).	†Example 17b: „Sie sind gestern nicht nach Aalen gefahren. [...] Sie legte das Buch nicht auf den Tisch. [...] Wir konnten uns nicht an diesen Vorfall erinnern. [...] Er blieb nicht in Rostock. [...] Sie ist sicher nicht dumm. [...] Sie war heute nicht im Büro [...]“ (478-	„Einige Reiseteilnehmer interessierten sich nicht für das Schloss/für eine Schlossbesichtigung/für Schlösser/dafür“ (305).	

	Helbig/Busch	Hammer	Hall/Scheiner	Duden
		9).		
29. <i>nicht</i>	[Sondernegation] vor dem Präpobj + Akzent (551)	“may follow prepositional objects...if it is relatively unstressed and the complement itself is to be given prominence” (479).	∅	∅
	†Example 28a: „Er zweifelt <i>nicht</i> an seinen Vorhaben.—Er zweifelt an seinem Vorhaben <i>nicht</i> . Er erinnert sich <i>nicht</i> an mich.—Er erinnert sich an mich <i>nicht</i> “ (551).	„Compare: Das kann ich doch <i>nicht</i> von ihm verlangen. <i>I can't ask that of him</i> . Das kann ich doch von <i>ihm</i> nicht verlangen. <i>I can't ask that of him</i> “ (479).		
	<i>Integrierte Substantive</i>			
30. <i>nicht</i>	cannot follow <i>lexikalische Prädikatsteile</i> (550)	“precedes objects...with no article which are part of a verb phrase...” (478).	„vor artikellosen Substantiven, die fast schon zu einem Teil des Verbs geworden sind...” (307).	„Wenn Substantive... als Nebenkern ins Prädikat integriert sind, steht <i>nicht</i> ...” (par.1438).
	„Sie fährt nicht <i>Auto</i> “ (550).	„Sie hatte damals nicht Klavier gespielt“ (478).	„Auto/Boot/Bus/Karussell/Kolonne/Lift/Rad/Rollschuhe/Schlitten/Schlittschuhe/Schritt/Seilbahnen/Ski fahren Wort halten	„Sie konnten mit der Entwicklung <i>nicht</i> Schritt halten (*Sie konnte mit der Entwicklung <i>keinen</i>

	Helbig/Busch	Hammer	Hall/Scheiner	Duden
			Radio hören Amok/Gefahr/Ski/Spießbruten/Sturm laufen Bankrott/Feierabend/Schluss machen Pfeife rauchen Bescheid sagen Maschine schreiben Flöte/Fußball/Karten/Klavier/Schach/S kat/Tennis spielen Schlange stehen [...] z.B. Die Touristen mussten vor dem Museum nicht Schlange stehen“ (307).	Schritt halten.)“ (par. 1438).
31. <i>nicht</i>	Nullartikel → “in einigen festen Verbindungen von Verb und Akkusativ ohne Objektscharakter, die nicht durch ein Verb ersetzt werden können...” (554).	“noun is felt to be the equivalent of a separable prefix, as it is so closely connected with the verb...” (108).	(see 30c)	∅
	„Er kann Auto fahren. → Er kann <i>nicht</i> Auto fahren. Sie schreibt Maschine. → Sie schreibt <i>nicht</i> Maschine. Der Freund hält Wort. → Der Freund hält nicht Wort. Ebenso: Ski laufen, Schritt fahren, Gefahr laufen u.a“ (554).	„Er spielt nicht Klavier[.] Sie läuft nicht Schi[.] Sie haben in Berlin nicht Wurzel gefaßt[.] Er hält nicht Wort[.] Er kann nicht Auto fahren[.] Sie schreibt nicht Maschine“(108).	(see example 30c)	
32. <i>nicht</i>	∅	“In a few cases either <i>kein</i> or <i>nicht</i> is	∅	∅

	Helbig/Busch	Hammer	Hall/Scheiner	Duden
<i>oder kein</i>		possible...“ (108).		
		„Er spricht kein/nicht Deutsch[.] Sie hat keinen/nicht Abschied von ihm genommen[.] Wir haben heute keinen/nicht Tennis gespielt“ (108).		
	<i>Funktionsverbgefüge</i>			
33. <i>nicht</i>	[Satznegation] cannot follow <i>nominale Teile von Funktionsverbgefügen</i> (550)	∅ (see 31b, 35b)	„steht...vor Funktionsverbgefügen...“ (305)	(see 4d)
	„Er bringt das Stück nicht <i>zur Aufführung</i> . Sie nahm nicht Rücksicht <i>auf ihre Kinder</i> “ (550).		„ (8a) Der Reiseleiter besitzt nicht die Fähigkeit anschaulich zu erzählen. (8b) Die Touristen haben den Reiseleiter nicht in Verlegenheit gebracht“ (305).	
34. <i>nicht</i>	muss vor dem Akk stehen: Funktionsverbgefüge (FVG) und lex.Prädikteile (551)	∅ (see 31b, 35b)	∅ (see 34c)	∅
	„Er spielt <i>nicht</i> Klavier. (=auf dem Klavier) *Er spielt Klavier <i>nicht</i> . Er fährt <i>nicht</i> Auto. (=mit dem Auto) *Er fährt Auto <i>nicht</i> Er nahm <i>nicht</i> Abschied. (=verabschiedete sich)			

	Helbig/Busch	Hammer	Hall/Scheiner	Duden
	*Er nahm Abschied <i>nicht</i> . Aber: Er nahm das Geld <i>nicht</i> “ (551).			
35. <i>kein</i>	Nullartikel → „feste Verbindung“ → „Substantiv + Verb = Verb“ (554)	“generally [used with] phrasal verbs with nouns...” (108).	(see 13c)	∅
	„Er holte Atem. (= atmete) → Er holte <i>keinen</i> Atem Sie hatte Angst. (=ängstigte sich) → Sie hatte <i>keine</i> Angst (554)“	„ <i>Atem holen, sich Mühe geben, Freude empfinden</i> , and all those with <i>haben</i> , e.g. <i>Angst, Durst, Hunger haben</i> , etc...” (108). „Er hat sich keine Mühe gegeben[.] Ich habe keinen Durst [.] Dabei hat er keine Freude empfunden. Sie hatten keine Angst“ (108).	(see example 13c)	
36. <i>kein</i>	Nullartikel → „feste Verbindung“ → „Substantiv + Verb = Adjektiv“ (554)	(see 31b, 35b)	(see 13c)	∅
	„Er hatte Hunger. (=war hungrig) → Er hatte <i>keinen</i> Hunger. Sie hatte Mut. (=war mutig) → Sie hatte <i>keinen</i> Mut“ (554).			
37. <i>kein</i>	Nullartikel → „feste Verbindung“ → „Präposition +Substantiv = Adjektiv“ (554)	(see 31b, 35b)	(see 13c)	∅

	Helbig/Busch	Hammer	Hall/Scheiner	Duden
	„Das ist ein Problem von sehr großer Bedeutung. (= sehr bedeutungsvoll) →Das ist ein Problem von <i>keiner</i> sehr großen Bedeutung“ (554).			
38. <i>nicht</i> <i>oder</i> <i>kein</i>	„in einigen passivfähigen Funktionsverbgefügen von <i>nehmen</i> + Akkusativ...“ (555).	„general for phrasal verbs with <i>nehmen</i> ...“ (109).	„Manchmal werden <i>nicht</i> und <i>kein</i> alternativ gebraucht...“ (305).	“schwankende” Fälle (phrasal) (par. 1438)
	„Er hat Rücksicht genommen. →Er hat <i>nicht</i> Rücksicht genommen. →Er hat <i>keine</i> Rücksicht genommen. Sie werden Rache nehmen. →Sie werden <i>nicht</i> Rache nehmen. →Sie werden <i>keine</i> Rache nehmen“ (555).	„Er hat <i>keine/nicht</i> Rücksicht auf mich genommen [...] Sie wollen <i>keine/nicht</i> Rache nehmen“ (109).	„Er rechnet nicht mit einer Niederlage. Er rechnet mit keiner Niederlage. Die Reisegruppe ist nicht in Gefahr. Die Reisegruppe ist in keiner Gefahr“ (305).	„Phrasal: Wir können darauf <i>keinen</i> Bezug nehmen. Nicht phrasal: Wir können darauf <i>nicht</i> Bezug nehmen. Ähnlich: Wir hatten <i>keine/nicht</i> Angst. Ich habe <i>keinen/nicht</i> Hunger“ (par 1438).
	<i>Freie Lokalangabe</i>			
39. <i>nicht</i>	„vor oder hinter den freien lokalen Angaben...“ (551). [Präpositionalgruppe oder Adverb]	“follows all adverbials except those of manner...” (478).	„steht...meist vor Lokalangaben mit Präposition...“ (309).	∅
	„Ich traf ihn im Café (dort) <i>nicht</i> .—Ich traf ihn <i>nicht</i> im Café (dort)“ (551).	„Sie haben sich seit langem nicht gesehen[...] Den Turm sieht man von hier aus nicht [...]“	„Der Reiseleiter holte die Touristen nicht am Flughafen ab“ (309).	

	Helbig/Busch	Hammer	Hall/Scheiner	Duden
		Ich wollte es ihr trotzdem nicht geben [...] Das ist mir in diesem Zusammenhang nicht aufgefallen [...] Wir sind wegen des Regens nicht nach Füssen gewandert [...] Sie haben gestern nicht gut gespielt [...] Ich weiß es nicht ausführlich“ (478).		
40. <i>nicht</i>	(see 39a)	∅ (see 39b)	„steht...vor oder nach Lokaladverbien...“ (309).	∅
			„Er holt sie nicht dort/dort nicht ab“ (309).	
	<i>Freie Kausalangabe</i>			
41. <i>nicht</i>	„vor oder hinter freien Kausalangaben“ (551) [Präpositionalgruppe]	∅ (see 39b)	„steht...meist nach Kausalangaben...mit Präposition...“ (309).	∅
	„Er erschien wegen des Essens <i>nicht</i> . (Satznegation) Er erschien <i>nicht</i> wegen des Essens. (Sondernegation oder Satznegation)“ (551).		„Die Bootsfahrt auf der Seine fand wegen des Regens nicht statt“ (309).	
42. <i>nicht</i>	muss „hinter freien Kausalangaben [stehen], wenn diese durch Adverbien	∅ (see 39b)	„steht...[immer] nach Kausalangaben [mit] Adverbien...“ (309).	∅

	Helbig/Busch	Hammer	Hall/Scheiner	Duden
	repräsentiert sind...“ (551).			
	„Er erschien deshalb <i>nicht</i> . (Satznegation) *Er erschien <i>nicht</i> deshalb. Er erschien <i>nicht</i> deshalb, sondern... (Sondernegation)“ (551).		„Es regnete. Die Bootsfahrt fand deswegen nicht statt“ (309).	
	<i>Freie Temporalangabe</i>			
43. <i>nicht</i>	„vor [oder] nach freien Temporalangaben“ (552) (Präpositionalgruppe)	∅ (see 39b)	„steht...meist nach Temporalangaben mit Präposition“ (309).	∅
	„Er besucht mich am Abend <i>nicht</i> . (Satznegation) Er besucht mich <i>nicht</i> am Abend (Sonder- oder Satznegation)“ (552).		„Einige Touristen schliefen in der Nacht nicht “ (309).	
44. <i>nicht</i>	„hinter [freien Temporalangaben] [durch einen Akkusativ repräsentiert]“ (552)	∅ (see 39b)	„steht...immer nach [Temporalangaben] im Akkusativ...“ (309).	∅
	„Der Autobus fährt <i>nicht</i> zwei Tage. (Sondernegation) Der Autobus fährt zwei Tage <i>nicht</i> (Satznegation)“ (552).		„ Einige Touristen schliefen die ganze Nacht nicht “ (309).	
	<i>Temporaladverb</i>			
45. <i>nicht</i>	hinter Temporaladverbien, „die unabhäng vom Standpunkt des Sprechenden sind (<i>heute</i> , <i>morgen</i> , <i>gestern</i> , <i>oft</i> , <i>lange</i> u.a.)...“ (552).	∅ (see 39b)	„steht...nach bestimmten [Temporaladverbien] (z.B. bisher, damals, demnächst, gestern, häufig, heute, jetzt, manchmal, mehrmals, meistens, mittags, montags, oft, seither, vorher, zunächst)...“ (309).	∅

	Helbig/Busch	Hammer	Hall/Scheiner	Duden
	„Er besuchte uns gestern <i>nicht</i> (Satznegation) Vorangestelltes <i>nicht</i> ist immer Sondernegation: Er besuchte uns <i>nicht</i> gestern, sondern vorgestern“ (552).		„Einige Touristen schliefen gestern nicht “ (309).	
46. <i>nicht</i>	„ <i>vor</i> ...Temporaladverbien, die vom Standpunkt der Sprechende abhängig sind (<i>gleich, bald, spät, zeitig</i> u.a.) und mit einigen durativen Verben unverträglich sind (<i>Er blieb gestern. Aber: *Er blieb spät.</i>)...“ (552).	∅ (see 39b)	„steht vor folgenden Temporaladverbien: bald, beizeiten, eher, früh, gleich, immer, jährlich, monatlich, nochmals, pünktlich, rechtzeitig, selten, sofort, sogleich, spät, stets, täglich, wöchentlich, zeitig, zugleich...“ (309).	∅
	„Er besucht uns <i>nicht</i> bald.--*Er besucht uns bald <i>nicht</i> “ (552).		„Andere schliefen nicht sofort ein“ (309).	
	Modalangabe			
47. <i>nicht</i>	„ <i>vor</i> freien Modalangaben“ (Präpositionalgruppe, Modaladverb) †Satznegation unmöglich: „In Sätzen mit einer Modalbestimmung kann nur [die Modalangabe], nicht aber die gesamte Prädikation negiert werden...“ (552).	∅ (see 39b)	„steht...vor Modalangaben mit Präposition bzw. als Adjektiv oder als Adverb...“ (309).	∅
	„(1) Er las <i>nicht</i> mit guter Aussprache. (2) *Er las mit guter Aussprache <i>nicht</i> .“		„Die Touristen verlassen Paris nicht ohne Bedauern/ nicht gern“ (309).	

	Helbig/Busch	Hammer	Hall/Scheiner	Duden
	(3) Er las <i>nicht</i> richtig. (4) *Er las richtig <i>nicht</i> “ (552).			
	Modalwort			
48. <i>nicht</i>	muss hinter Modalwörtern stehen †Sondernegation unmöglich: „Modalwörter [sind] selbst nicht negierbar, da sie Einstellungsoperatoren sind“ (553).	∅ (see 39b)	„steht...nach Modalwörtern (z.B. absolut, angeblich, anscheinend, bekanntlich, bestimmt, eigentlich, grundsätzlich, hoffentlich, im Allg, körperlich, leider, möglicherweise, natürlich, sicher(lich), theoretisch, vermutlich, vlt, wahrscheinlich, wirklich, zweifellose, zu seinem Bedauern, zum Glück, Gott sei Dank, zu allem Unglück)...“ (309).	∅
	„Er besucht uns vermutlich <i>nicht</i> . *Er besucht uns <i>nicht</i> vermutlich“ (553).		„Eine Verlängerung der Reise klappte leider nicht “ (309).	
	Zusätzliche Regeln			
49. <i>kein</i>			„negiert...artikellose Substantive mit dem Pronomen <i>andere</i> ...“ (306).	
			„Er kennt andere Länder. Er kennt keine anderen Länder“ (306).	
50. <i>nicht</i>	Nullartikel→“bei geographischen Namen“ (555)			
	„Er wohnt in Polen. →Er wohnt <i>nicht</i> in Polen. Sie arbeitet in Stuttgart. →Sie arbeitet <i>nicht</i> in Stuttgart“ (555).			
51.	Nullartikel→“feste			

	Helbig/Busch	Hammer	Hall/Scheiner	Duden
<i>kein</i>	Verbindung“→“Zwillingsforme In (auch mit <i>weder...noch</i>)“ (554)			
	„Dort gab es Baum und Strauch. →Dort gab es <i>keinen</i> Baum und <i>keinen</i> Strauch (Dort gab es <i>weder</i> Baum <i>noch</i> Strauch.)“ (554).			
52. <i>kein</i>	Nullartikel→“in Listen (Aufzählungen)“ (554)			
	„Mitzubringen sind: Schlafsack, Waschzeug, Besteck, aber <i>keine</i> Skistiefel und <i>keinen</i> Radiorekorder“ (554).			
53. <i>kein</i>	„als Artikelwort kann in den meisten Fällen nicht wegfallen, ohne dass der Satz ungrammatisch wird...“ (555).			
	„Werner ist kein Faulpelz. →*Werner ist Faulpelz. Dadurch unterscheidet sich <i>kein</i> von <i>nicht</i> , das grundsätzlich strukturell fakultativ ist und deshalb auch dort weggelassen werden kann, wo es in einer ähnlichen Umgebung wie <i>kein</i> steht. Werner ist <i>nicht</i> Lehrer. →Werner ist Lehrer“ (556).			
54.		“Some idiomatic		

	Helbig/Busch	Hammer	Hall/Scheiner	Duden
<i>kein</i>		uses...as a determiner..." (109).		
		„Sie ist noch keine zehn Jahre alt[...] Es ist noch keine acht Uhr [...] keine (sic) zwei Stunden vor meiner Abreise [...] Es ist noch keine fünf Minuten her [...] Sie ist schließlich kein Kind mehr [...] keine Zeitungen und auch keine Bücher“ (109).		
55. <i>nicht oder kein</i>		„ <i>nicht ein</i> and <i>kein</i> are alternatives...with <i>sondern...</i> “ (109).		
		„Das ist nicht ein/kein Roman, sondern eine Bibliographie“ (109).		
56. <i>nicht ein</i>		“ <i>nicht ein</i> is more usual than <i>kein</i> after <i>wenn</i> ,if‘...“ (109).		
		„Man hätte ihn kihm (sic) bemerkt, wenn khm (sic) nicht ein		

	Helbig/Busch	Hammer	Hall/Scheiner	Duden
		Schnurrbart etwas Distinguiertes verliehen hätte“(109).		
57. -				„Geltungsbereich...der Negation lässt sich mit einer Umschreibungsprobe bestimmen[...]‘Es ist nicht der Fall, dass... ‘...‘“ (par 1430).
				„Anna hat das Buch <i>nicht</i> gelesen. →Es ist <i>nicht</i> der Fall, dass Anna das Buch gelesen hat“ (par. 1430).

Vita

Kathleen M. Schuster was born in Aurora, Colorado. After graduating from Bearden High School in 2002, she entered the University of Tennessee at Knoxville where she completed a B.A. in German *Summa Cum Laude* in 2007. In August, 2007, she entered the Graduate School at the same university. Over the course of her undergraduate and graduate career she participated in two academic exchanges, the first at the Universität Bonn from 2004-2006, the second at the Universität Mannheim from 2007-2008.