First publ. in: Particle Verbs in English : Syntax, information structure and intonation / Nicole Dehé.
Amsterdam : Benjamins, 2002, pp. 1-14

CHAPTER 1

Introduction

The work presented in this book contributes to the discussion of a well-known construction that occurs in most, if not all, of the Germanic languages (cf. (1)) and has been referred to in the literature for example as *verb-particle construction*, *phrasal verb*, *separable (complex) verb* or *particle verb*.

(1) Particle Verbs across Germanic Languages
(the Scandinavian examples are borrowed from Svenonius 1994, 1996a, b)

a. German: Sie *sagten* das Konzert *ab*.
They said the concert Part
'They called off the concert.'

b. Dutch: Hans *belde* zijn moeder *op*.
Hans called his mother Part
'Hans phoned up his mother.'

c. Danish: Han *gav* sine studier *op*.
He gave his studies Part
'He gave up his studies.'

d. Norwegian: Vi *slapp* hunden *ut*.
We let dog.the Part
'We let the dog out.'

e. Swedish: Johan *skrev* *upp* numret.
Johan wrote Part number.the
'Johan wrote down the number.'

f. Faroese: Teir *vinda* reint flagg *opp*.
They pulled white flag Part
'They pulled up the white flag.'

g. Icelandic: Ég *tók* *tupp* kartöflur.
I picked Part potatoes
'I picked up potatoes.'

h. English: Sam *turned down* the radio.

In this introductory chapter, I will provide the reader with some basic descriptive facts about the particle verb construction in English. I will also give a preview of the organisation of this book.

1. Some general remarks on particle verbs

In general, the particle verb construction can appear in transitive, intransitive, or more complex variants, which is illustrated in (2) through (4) for English.

(2) Transitive Particle Verbs

a. Poirot *found out* the details.
b. Nicole *finished off* her thesis.
c. The little girl *laced up* her shoes.
d. The woman had been *hanging out* the clothes.
e. The man *paid off* his debts.
f. He *put down* his coffee-cup.
g. The workers *loaded up* the van.
h. The professor *handed out* the papers.

(3) Intransitive Particle Verbs

a. The prices *came down* last month.
b. The months *went by*.
c. The two girls were *growing up*.
d. Unexpectedly, another opportunity *turned up*.
e. Granny would never die. She would *live on*.
(D. H. Lawrence, *The Virgin and the Gipsy*: 73)
f. I will *own up* [...] that I couldn't think of everything for a while.
(E. H. Porter, *Pollyanna*: 69)
g. His feeling of terror had *passed away* [...].
(Oscar Wilde, *the Picture of Dorian Gray*)
h. [...] Lucille flew at me and told me to *shut up*.
(D. H. Lawrence, *The Virgin and the Gipsy*: 40)

(4) Complex Particle Verb Constructions[1]

a. They *made* John *out* a liar.
b. They *painted* the barn *up* red.
c. They *put* the books *down* on the shelf.
d. They *sent* a schedule *out* to the stockholders.
((a)–(d) taken from den Dikken 1995: 55f.)

e. The crew *handed* the passengers *back* the passport.
(Radford 1997:444)

f. Andrew will *print* his teacher *out* a copy.

g. Valerie *packed* her daughter *up* a lunch.

h. Susan *poured* the man *out* a drink.

Particle verbs have been dealt with continually in the linguistic literature from various perspectives, including theoretical viewpoints such as their morphological and syntactic behaviour and representation (cf. Chapter 2 of this book), and the semantics of the construction (cf. e.g. the introductory chapters to Olsen 1998a and Dehé et al. 2002 and references given there), but also psycholinguistic aspects have been considered, such as the behaviour of particle verbs in speech production and processing (cf. e.g. Drews, Zwitserlood, et al. 1994; Zwitserlood, Drews, et al. 1996; Hillert 1998; Roelofs 1998; Urban & Friederici 1999; Urban 2001, 2002), and language acquisition (cf. Hyams, Johnson, & Schaeffer 1993; Broihier, Hyams, et al. 1994; Bennis et al. 1995 among others). Simultaneously, the Germanic languages which display the construction have all been studied in this respect (cf. e.g. Abraham 1993, 1995; Stiebels & Wunderlich 1994; Stiebels 1996; Olsen 1996, 1997b; Zeller 2001c; Wurmbrand 2000a, b; Lüdeling 2001, for German; Booij 1990; Neeleman & Weerman 1993; Neeleman 1994; Koopman 1995; van Marle 2002, for Dutch; and Åfarli 1985; Svenonius 1994, 1996a, b; Toivonen 2002, and references given there for the Scandinavian languages). I will focus on transitive particle verbs constructions (hereafter PV's) in English, as given in (2) above and in (5) through (7) below. I will be concerned primarily with the syntax of PV's but will draw on evidence from speech production and also evidence from intonation patterns, as well.

The syntactic behaviour of PV's in English has frequently been described in the literature (cf. e.g. Bolinger 1971; Fraser 1976; Lindner 1983) and the basic facts have most recently been reviewed by Jackendoff (2002). The perhaps most striking property of transitive PV's in English is their appearance in two alternating orders. The particle appears adjacent to the verb and precedes the DP-complement in (5), which I will refer to as the *continuous order* or *construction*. In the *discontinuous order/construction* (cf. (6)), the particle follows the DP-object. This latter word order is obligatory with unstressed pronouns, as is illustrated in (7).[2]

(5) PV's: Continuous Order

a. He *wiped off* the table.

b. He *took out* the lady.

c. He *looked up* the information.

(6) PV's: Discontinuous Order

a. He *wiped* the table *off.*
b. He *took* the lady *out.*
c. He *looked* the information *up.*

(7) Unstressed Pronouns

a. He wiped *it* off.
b. *He wiped off *it.*
c. He took *her* out.
d. *He took out *her.*

In English, the continuous order is a criterion for the distinction between elements that can function as particles and elements that cannot. In general, particles in English are homomorph with prepositions (e.g. *up, out, in, off*) or simple adverbs (e.g. *away, back, together*) (cf. Jackendoff 1973:346; Emonds 1985:253; Olsen 2000:152). Therefore, it has been argued that the true test of a particle verb in English is the ability of the particle to appear adjacent to the verb stem in a position preceding the direct object, i.e. its appearance in the continuous order (cf. Olsen 2000: 152f among others). Pure adverbs or prepositions cannot appear in this position (cf. (8), borrowed from Olsen 2000:152).

(8) Continuous Order

a. *Particles*
Nicole carried *out, in, up, down, along, around, back* the basket.
b. *Pure adverbs*
Nicole carried/pushed *upwards, inside, ahead, together* the chairs.

Note that this test (among others) has also been suggested as a distinguishing criterion between prepositional verbs and PV's (cf. e.g. Fraser 1976:2; Lindner 1983:5). Consider the examples in (9). Particles, but not prepositions, occur in the position adjacent to the verb. (For more syntactic tests to distinguish prepositional verbs from PV's, cf. e.g. Fraser 1976:1ff.; Lindner 1983:4ff.; Radford 1988:90ff.; Wollmann 1996:42ff. among many others.)

(9) Prepositional Verbs (a) vs. Particle Verbs (b)

a. He *walked up* the road.
*He *walked* the road *up.*
He is *getting off* the bus.
*He is *getting* the bus *off.*

b. He *picked up* the handout.
He *picked* the handout *up*.
He *turned off* the lights.
He *turned* the lights *off*.

In the remainder of this study, main emphasis will be placed on the alternation between the continuous PV construction and the discontinuous order. I will show that the alternation between the two options is not free. In the literature, various factors have been suggested that govern this alternation (cf. Chapter 3). However, I will argue that most of these factors reduce to one point, namely the theory of information structure (IS). I will show that, with the continuous order as the underlying/neutral one (Chapter 3), the choice of the word order is highly influenced by the IS of the context in which the relevant PV construction is embedded. Based on the relation between IS and intonation, evidence for my assumption will be provided from intonation patterns of transitive PV's in English along with empirical data (Chapter 4). Finally, I will propose a syntactic analysis for PV's in English that accounts for the impact that IS has on the word order alternation (Chapter 5).

2. Particle verb classifications

In the literature, different groups of PV's have been distinguished mainly with regard to their semantic properties, but also with respect to their syntactic behaviour. A common distinction is between three groups: (1) semantically compositional or transparent PV constructions, (2) idiomatic PV's, and (3) aspectual PV's. The meaning of *compositional PV's* is made up of the literal meaning of the verb plus the literal meaning of the particle. The particles in these uses are often directional or spatial in meaning, as in the examples in (10) below. In this use, the particle can often be replaced by an appropriate (directional) PP (cf. (10e) and (f) in particular), a fact that has given rise to the assumption that the particle saturates an argument position of the verb (cf. Wurmbrand 1998 and Jackendoff 2002 among many others). In this connection and based on the fact mentioned above that particles are homomorph to prepositions and simple adverbs, Olsen (1998b, 2000) mentions a structural ambiguity between compositional PV constructions on the one hand and V plus adverb constructions on the other hand. I will return to the relevant assumptions in some detail in Chapter 2.3.2 below. *Idiomatic PV's* form a semantic unit whose meaning is not fully predictable from the meaning of its constituents (cf. (11)). Typically,

the string [V Part] in this use can be paraphrased by a simplex verb, as is indicated in (11) below. In *aspectual PV's*, the particle adds an aspectual interpretation to the verb. The best-known and perhaps most productive particle in the aspectual PV construction is *up*, which telicises the event expressed by the verb. As opposed to the corresponding simplex verb, the action described by the verb is completed (cf. (12)).[3] As Brinton (1985: 160) puts it,

> [particles] may add the concept of a goal or an endpoint to durative situations which otherwise have no necessary terminus. That is, the particles may affect the intrinsic temporal nature of a situation and hence alter its aktionsart from atelic to telic.

Brinton (1985: 162ff.) uses a series of tests to establish the telic qualities of PV's, including the use of the structure *take an hour to PV* (*It took a year to use up the supplies*), the verb *finish* (*I finished sending out the invitations*), and the phrase *for/in an hour* (cf. (12a)). This aspectual, or telic function of verbal particles has led some authors to analyse them as a lexicalisation of the functional category telicity within the functional domain of the VP (e.g. Solà 1996; Dehé 1997, 2000a; cf. Chapter 2.4).

(10) Compositional PV constructions
- a. Sheila *carried* {*in*} the bags {*in*} (into the house).
- b. James *carried* {*up*} the suitcase {*up*} (up the stairs).
- c. Sam *took* {*out*} the clothes {*out*} (out of the suitcase).
- d. Mary *threw* {*out*} a box {*out*} (out of the room).
- e. The lady *put* the hat *on / on her head.*
- f. Sheila *put* the books *away / on the shelf / there.*

(11) Idiomatic PV constructions
- a. John will *turn* {*down*} that job {*down*}. ('refuse to accept')
- b. You shouldn't *put* {*off*} such tasks {*off*}. ('postpone')
- c. The baby *threw* {*up*} the meal {*up*}. ('vomit')
- d. They *ran* {*off*} the pamphlets {*off*}. ('copy')

(12) Aspectual PV constructions
- a. John *ate* {*up*} the cake {*up*}.
  John ate the cake for an hour.
  *John ate up the cake for an hour.
- b. Ann *used* {*up*} her money {*up*}.
- c. We *painted* {*up*} the house {*up*}.
- d. Greg *cleaned* {*up*} the car {*up*}.

A threefold distinction of this kind can be found for example in Emonds (1985:252f.). His use of particles as *directional adverbs* corresponds to the spatial/directional use of particles in compositional PV's such as those in (10) above. Aspectual particles are called *completive verb-particle combinations* in Emond's terms. A distinction along these lines has also been suggested by Jackendoff (2002). Jackendoff distinguishes idiomatic PV's, directional PV's and aspectual PV's. In his terms, idiomatic PV's such as *look up* ('search for and find') and *throw up* ('vomit') have non-compositional meanings and are therefore listed in the lexicon as complete units. In the directional PV construction, particles occur with verbs that select a directional (Path) PP, such as *carry in/away/back*. According to Jackendoff, the particle in these uses satisfies one of the verb's argument positions and the meaning is fully compositional. Accordingly, there is no need to list these combinations in the lexicon. The particles in aspectual PV's can mark completeness, such as *up* in *drink/eat up the milk/cake* or – in a more specific and restricted case – it indicates the continuation of an action such as *away* in *sleep the day away*. This latter construction has been discussed in some detail in Jackendoff (1997). In addition to *up* and *away*, Jackendoff (2002) mentions *through* (*play the aria through*), *on* (*run on, sing on*) and *over* (*write the paper over*) as further aspectual particles. In the aspectual PV construction, both *on* and *away* lose their literal, directional meaning. As opposed to the completive, telic use of *up*, both *on* and *away* render their VP atelic. According to Jackendoff (2002), *through* adds an aspectual meaning that can be paraphrased by *from beginning to end* (*play the aria through/from beginning to end*), whereas aspectual *over* means *again* (*write the paper over/again*). I refer the reader to Jackendoff (1997, 2002) for more details about these particles and their particular uses.

A different classification, but one also involving three types of PV's, has been suggested by Ishikawa (1999). The criteria his suggestion is based on are the following: (1) does the particle retain its own meaning within the verb particle combination, where particle meaning can be either literal, i.e. spatial or directional, or completive, i.e. aspectual; (2) do the selectional properties of the verb change when it combines with a particle.

(13) Classification of PV's according to Ishikawa (1999; examples taken from pp. 331f.)

a. *Simple combination type*:
He cut {off} the branches {off}.

b. *Pure idiom type*:
The store keepers took {in} the students {in}.

c. *Hybrid idiom type*:
I'll look {up} the information {up}.

In PV combinations of the *simple combination type* (cf. (13a)), particles retain their own meaning and the selectional properties of the verbs are not changed. In (13a), *cut* selects a Theme argument just like in the simplex counterpart (*He cut the branches*). The particle *off* is used in its literal meaning. The simple combination type includes compositional PV constructions of the kind given in (10a) and (b) above; compare (14a) and (b) below, which show that the simplex counterparts to the verbs in (10a) and (b) select the same type of complement as the PV's. Notice, however, that the compositional PV's in (10e), and (f) would not belong to the simple combination type in Ishikawa's sense. According to Ishikawa's definition, PV's such as *put on* and *put away* must belong to the hybrid idiom type, where the particle retains its meaning, but the selectional properties of the verb change (see below). (14c) and (d) show that *put* as a simplex V cannot be used with the same type of complement as *put* as a PV, but that the selectional properties are different. Since the relevant verb particle combinations are fully transparent semantically, a classification along the lines of Ishikawa seems less attractive than the classification discussed above and outlined in (10) through (12).

(14) a. Sheila carried the bags.
b. James carried the suitcase.
c. *The lady put the hat.
d. *Sheila put the books.

Furthermore, it follows from Ishikawa's definition that aspectual PV's such as *eat up* and *use up* in (12a) and (b) above belong to the simple combination type. With regard to the selectional properties, the verbs *eat* and *spend*, in (12a) and (b) respectively behave in the same way as *cut* in Ishikawa's example. Both *eat* and *spend* can occur without the particle, but with the object (*John ate the cake*, *Ann spent her money*). The particle *up* occurs in its aspectual (completive) literal meaning. However, there seems to be a clear difference between particles in aspectual PV's and particles in compositional PV's. The latter, but not the former can be replaced by an appropriate complement PP, as is illustrated in (15). The difference between these two types cannot be accounted for in Ishikawa's classification.

(15) a. Sheila carried the bags [$_{\text{Part}}$ *in*] / [$_{\text{PP}}$ *into the house*] / [$_{\text{PP}}$ *to her car*].
b. John ate the cake [$_{\text{Part}}$ *up*] / [$_{\text{PP}}$???].

Particles in PV combinations of the *pure idiom type* in the sense of Ishikawa (1999) lose their own meaning. Moreover, there is a change in the selectional properties of the verb. In (13b), the combination *take in* is used in the meaning of *to deceive*. Both verb and particle lose their original meaning and the selectional properties of the verb change in that *take* selects an animate object which it does not in regular cases. In combinations of the third type suggested by Ishikawa, the *hybrid idiom type*, particles retain their meaning, but the selectional properties of the verb change. In (13c), *look up* is idiomatic since its meaning is not a combination of the meaning of its parts. However, according to Ishikawa (1999:332), *up* is used literally in the meaning of "completion", "temporal end point". The selectional properties of *look* are changed, since *look* is not normally used with a DP complement (**He looks the word*, **He looks the street)*.

Ishikawa's classification translates into certain differences between the three types with regard to syntactic structure. PV's of the pure idiom type are treated as complex heads which can be separated in the syntax in order to derive the discontinuous order. Particles in PV combinations of both the simple combination type and the hybrid idiom type enter the derivation as PP-complement to the verb, with the direct object in Spec-VP position. In order to derive the continuous order, the particle incorporates into the verb. I will return to Ishikawa's proposal in Chapter 5.

Apart from these threeway classifications, a number of authors distinguish between two groups of PV's, namely semantically transparent / compositional PV's on the one hand, and idiomatic PV constructions on the other hand. These classifications would summarise Ishikawa's types (b) (pure idiom type) and (c) (hybrid idiom type) and also idiomatic PV's and aspectual PV's in the classification of Emonds and others under the group of *idiomatic PV's*. Both Aarts (1989) for English and Wurmbrand (2000a, b) for German distinguish between the two classes on the grounds of differences in their syntactic behaviour. In Aarts' work, compositional PV's are termed spatial-resultative PV's. I will summarise his criteria in Chapter 2.5 below. Wurmbrand mentions the following points. Particles in compositional PV constructions can be replaced by other particles from the same semantic class (16a) or can be contrasted with other particles (16b), whereas particles in idiomatic PV constructions cannot (16c).

(16) a. send *up, in, back, away*
b. send *up*, not *down / in*
c. eat *up, ??*

Moreover, she argues that if particles can be topicalised at all, then only particles of compositional PV constructions can do so. (Cf. German (17a) for a compositional, (17b) for an idiomatic PV. The examples and ratings are taken from Wurmbrand (2000:8). In fact, I do not agree with Wurmbrand on the judgement of (17a), which is deviant (though not as bad as (17b)) in my variety.

(17) Topicalisation of particles

a. [AUF]$_{Part}$ hat er die Tür t_{Part} gemacht.
[open]$_{Part}$ has he the door t_{Part} made
'He opened the door.'

b. *[AUF]$_{Part}$ haben sie das Stück t_{Part} geführt.
[Part]$_{Part}$ have they the piece t_{Part} performed
'They performed the piece.'

From the different syntactic behaviour of the two classes of PV's, Wurmbrand argues, different syntactic structures follow, namely a small clause structure for compositional PV constructions, but a complex V'-structure of the form V'[Part V^0] for idiomatic PV's (cf. also Chapter 2.5 below).

However, these kinds of classifications are not undisputed for various reasons. Most importantly, besides syntactic differences between compositional and idiomatic PV's, there are also syntactic similarities (cf. Lindner 1983:20ff.). The syntactic difference between the two classes is thus not clear cut. Both compositional and idiomatic PV's (but not prepositional verbs or verb plus adverb combinations) appear in the continuous order. Moreover, compositional and idiomatic PV's behave alike in the following syntactic surroundings. For example, they both undergo nominalisation (18a), the particle can be modified in the discontinuous but not the continuous construction (18b), and particle preposing in question formation is disallowed for both groups (18c).

(18) a. Nominalisation
a'. His tossing up of the ball. (compositional PV)
a''. His figuring out of the problem. (idiomatic PV)

b. Particle modification
a'. *He tossed quickly / right up the ball.
a''. *He figured quickly / right out the problem.

c. Questions
a'. *Up what did he toss?
a''. *Out what did he figure?

Based on these similarities, Lindner rejects analyses that suggest separate syntactic structures for compositional vs. idiomatic PV's. Moreover, the semantic differences between the PV classes do not seem to be clear cut, either. Gries (2000: 17) gives the example in (19). He argues that the meaning of *bring up* in (19) is "definitely not literal since *the town* has not been moved to a spatially higher position", but that the meaning is not fully idiomatic, either.

(19) It has taken many years to *bring the town up* to the standard.

However, I used a distinction between three kinds of PV's in the sense of Emonds (1985) and Jackendoff (2002) for the purposes of the speech production experiment I report on in Chapter 3. The results of the experimental study show that the classification has some validity to it. However, no differences were found between the groups with regard to intonation patterns as will become clear in Chapter 4.

I will not make any difference between the PV groups in elaborating a syntactic structure for PV constructions in Chapter 5. In the course of the discussion, I will follow Olsen (2000) in her assumption that true PV's of both the compositional and the idiomatic type (and also of the aspectual type) have the same underlying structure. Their structure is distinct, however, from the syntactic representation of verb plus simple adverb combinations. Evidence for this suggestion comes for example from modification (cf. Chapter 2.3.2).

3. Preview

The book is organised as follows. In Chapter 2, I will give a comprehensive survey of syntactic analyses that have been suggested in the literature for English PV constructions of the form given in (2), (5) and (6) above. Since I am in general concerned with PV's in English, I will focus on syntactic approaches to the English PV construction, rather than give a complete overview of approaches to the construction in all Germanic languages. The reader will be provided with references to approaches to the other Germanic languages in the introduction to Chapter 2 (cf. also Section 1.1 above). The previous approaches to the syntax of PV's introduced in Chapter 2 will be divided into five distinct groups. Traditional approaches will be presented along with various representatives of the small clause analysis, and of the extended-VP-analysis. In addition, I will mention two approaches which analyse the particle as a functional head of the category telicity. Analyses that do not fit into these four groups will also be introduced. The different types of analyses will be discussed in some detail. In

particular, I will reject the small clause analysis for PV constructions, and I will also argue against the particle as a functional category.

Chapter 3 contributes to the discussion on whether one of the two alternately possible word orders of PV's is the neutral, underlying one. I will briefly introduce the factors that have been suggested as governing this alternation and the speaker's choice of one construction over the other. I will then defend the hypothesis that the continuous order is the underlying one from which the discontinuous order must be derived by means of a syntactic operation. The opposite assumption will be rejected. Evidence in support of my conclusion comes from both the syntactic behaviour of PV constructions and from an experimental study that has been reported on in the literature (Hunter & Prideaux 1983), as well as from an experiment in speech production that I carried out.

In Chapter 4, I will be concerned with the questions of why and when speakers choose one of the constructions possible with PV's in English over the other. I argue that the word order is chosen according to the information structure of the context in which the PV construction is embedded. I will first give a brief introduction to the theory of information structure. I will then review the previous literature on PV's and information structure and provide additional data. Subsequently, I will turn to evidence from the intonation patterns of PV constructions, based on the relation between information structure and intonation in general, or, more precisely, on the relation between focus and accent placement in particular. There have been some vague assumptions in the previous literature on PV's on the relation between the chosen word order on the one hand and focus structure and accent placement on the other hand. This relation will be explored in some detail. I conducted two experimental studies in order to provide new insights on intonation patterns of PV constructions. The results of these studies provide strong additional evidence in support of the hypothesis that information structure is the determining factor in the choice of the word order with PV constructions in English. With these results in mind, I will return once again to the factors that have been proposed in the literature as influential factors on the choice of the word order in the final section of Chapter 4. I will show that nearly all of these factors follow from the theory of information structure.

In Chapter 5, I will return to the syntax of PV constructions. I will map the role that information structure plays with regard to particle and object placement onto the syntactic structure of the English PV construction. I propose a syntactic structure for PV's in English that integrates a focus feature. This feature does not belong to the set of formal features in the sense of Chomsky

(1995). However, I will suggest that it is this focus feature, its assignment to the relevant category, and a corresponding principle (*Condition on focus domains*) that triggers the stranding of the particle in the position following the object-DP, i.e. the derivation of the discontinuous construction. In developing the syntactic structure I will take into account the evidence that has been provided in the generative literature of the past decade in favour of overt verb and object movement in English. Finally, Chapter 6 concludes this study with a summary and an outlook to possible future research.

In this study, I will only be concerned with the regular PV construction. By this I mean that I will for example not consider the set of idiomatic PV's that does not undergo the word order alternation (compare **sing out one's heart/sing one's heart out* and *give up the ghost* [to die] / **give the ghost up*; cf. Chapter 3.1 for more examples).

Let me add a final remark with regard to the method of this study. I seek to combine evidence from both theoretical, i.e. mainly syntactic, and experimental research. The aim of the study is to propose a syntactic structure for regular PV's in English that accounts for the word order alternation possible with the construction and the factors that determine the alternation. To this end, I provide and make use of evidence from linguistic areas other than syntax. This means, my suggestion for a syntactic structure is based on evidence from experimental work in the areas of speech production (Chapter 3) and intonation (Chapter 4). With regard to the syntactic framework, the guiding ideas assumed in this thesis follow Chomsky's (1993, 1995) *Minimalist Program* and related work. I will assume familiarity with this well-known framework, and thus will not provide an introduction to or a summary of the theory. The main concepts will be introduced where it seems necessary, but will otherwise be presupposed. Introductions to the theory of information structure and to the relevant aspects of the theory of intonation including phonological phrasing will be given in the corresponding chapters.

Notes

1. I do not claim that the examples in (4) all have an identical underlying syntactic structure. All I want to say is that these examples are more complex than the intransitive or transitive alternates.

2. Of the Scandinavian languages, Norwegian and Icelandic, but not Danish and Swedish, display the same alternation (cf. Svenonius 1994, 1996b). In Danish, the particle must follow the DP, i.e. Danish shows the discontinuous, but not the continuous order. On the contrary,

Swedish only has the continuous order, the particle obligatorily precedes the nominal object. In German as a V2 language, the verb is obligatorily separated from the particle in main clauses (*Sie sagten das Konzert ab*; cf. (1a)), but the verb and the particle appear adjacent in subordinate clauses (..., *daß sie das Konzert absagten*; [that they called off the concert]).

3. Lindner (1983:150ff.) seeks to give a more detailed picture of completive *up*. Cf. also Brinton (1985:157f.) for an overview of the relevant literature.