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Abstract

The paper has two goals:

- a more global one, viz. to present an overview of the variation concerning verb particles across the Germanic languages, and

- a more local one, to use some of this variation data to argue for Yiddish being an SOV-language like German and Dutch rather than an SVO-language like English and the Scandinavian languages.

I will start out by suggesting that prepositions and (separable) particles have the same structure:

(1) a. 

\[
\text{Spec} \rightarrow \text{PP} \rightarrow \text{P'} \rightarrow \text{P^o} \rightarrow \text{DP}
\]

b. 

\[
\text{Spec} \rightarrow \text{PrtP} \rightarrow \text{Prt'} \rightarrow \text{Prt^o} \rightarrow \text{DP}
\]

and that the difference is that prepositions assign case, whereas particles do not. Therefore the complement DP (e.g. the book in throw out the book) will not be assigned a case. This problem has two potential solutions:

- **EITHER** the particle is incorporated into the verb (i.e. into V*), in which case V* (maybe via the trace in Prt*) may now assign case to the "object",

- **OR** the DP may move to PrtP-spec, where it can be assigned case directly by V° (as in ECM-constructions).

Both of these two constructions are straightforwardly passivisable.

The picture can be extended to the Germanic SOV-languages, assuming that what differs between SVO and SOV is the ordering inside V' and inside V* (i.e. **syntactic** ordering, which concerns separable particles, e.g. go under), but crucially **NOT** inside V° (i.e. **morphological** ordering, which concerns non-separable particles, e.g. undergo).

I also show that the view that Yiddish is an OV-language like German and Dutch, not a VO-language like English or Danish, is supported by facts concerning verb particles. I shall argue against Diesing's (1997:383) claim that particles may not form the basis of an argument for the underlying order of Yiddish being OV.

The point is that only if Yiddish is an OV-language like German and Dutch, not a VO-language like English or Danish, can we explain why Yiddish is like German and unlike Scandinavian in allowing even such particles to occur preverbally in non-V2 constructions that do not incorporate, as seen by their not moving along with the finite verb during V2, by their ability to topicalise, and by their requiring participial/infinitival forms with intervening -ge-/tsu-.
1. Separable particles

1.1 The differences between prepositions and (separable) particles

One difference between prepositions (P°) and (separable) particles (Prt°) in English is that prepositions have to **precede** their DP-complement, whereas the particle may either **precede** or **follow** the object DP:

(2) En. a. I accidentally stepped **on** the radio. P°
   b. * I accidentally stepped **the radio on**.

(3) En. a. I accidentally switched **on** the radio. Prt°
   b. I accidentally switched **the radio on**.

Haegeman & Guéron (1999:250-254) mention the following other differences:

- Whereas [P°+DP] may undergo *wh-movement*, this is not possible for [Prt°+DP]:

(4) En. a. In which hotel did the Beatles stay ____? P°
   b. * In which door did the Stones kick ____? Prt°

- Whereas [P°+DP] may undergo *clefing*, this is not possible for [Prt°+DP]:

(5) En. a. It was in this hotel that the Beatles stayed _____. P°
   b. * It was in this door that the Stones kicked _____. Prt°

- Whereas [P°+DP] may be *coordinated* with another [P°+DP], [Prt°+DP] may not be coordinated with another [Prt°+DP]:

(6) En. a. He looked **up** the chimney and **down** the stairwell. P°
   b. * She switched **off the TV and on the light.** Prt°

- Whereas [P°+DP] may be *modified*, e.g. by *right* or *straight*, this is not possible for [Prt°+DP]:

(7) En. a. The Beatles stayed **right in this hotel.** P°
   b. * The Stones kicked **right in this door.** Prt°

- Consider finally *ellipsis*, i.e. leaving out a constituent that has already occurred in the discourse. Elision of the verb itself is only possible in the preposition case, not in the particle case:

(8) En. a. He looked up the chimney and she looked down the stairwell. P°
   b. He looked up the chimney and she _____ down the stairwell.

(9) En. a. He switched off the TV and she switched on the light. Prt°
   b. * He switched off the TV and she _______ on the light.
On the other hand, the sequence \( V^o + Prt^o \) may undergo elision, whereas this is not possible for the sequence \( V^o + P^o \).

(10) En. a. He looked up the chimney and she looked up the stairwell.  
   b. * He looked up the chimney and she _________ the stairwell.

(11) En. a. He switched off the TV and she switched off the light.  
   b. He switched off the TV and she _________ the light.

1.2 Verbs and particles in the Germanic SVO-languages

The analysis of the examples with prepositions is uncontroversial, as in (12)a:

(12) a.  
```
+---+       +---+  
  V°  PP         V°  DP  
  step       on    the radio
```

b.  
```
+---+       +---+  
  V°  P°         V°  Prt°  
  on   PP        on    DP  
  the radio
```

The analysis of the particle examples, however, is not uncontroversial. Consider the "single verb hypothesis", as in (12)b above (where \( V^* \) signals a "complex lexical unit", Haegeman & Guéron 1999:254, i.e. more than a \( V^o \) but less than a \( V' \), cf. section 2.1 below and references there).

One reason why the particle and the verb do not just form a \( V^o \) (i.e. the reason why the particle is not simply incorporated) is that the particle may be topicalised in e.g. both Swedish and Danish:

(13) a. Sw. Ut kastade dom mej inte, bara ned för trappan.  
   b. Da. Ud smed de mig ikke, kun ned ad trappen.  
   (Holmberg 1999: 17)

```
Out threw they me not, just down of stairs-the
```

In (12)a, \([P^o + DP]\) make up a constituent, namely PP, which accounts for why \([P^o + DP]\) may undergo wh-movement, (4)a, clefting, (5)a, coordination, (6)a, and modification, (7)a. The verb may undergo gapping on its own, (8)b, as it is a constituent, but the verb and the preposition may not undergo gapping together, (10)b, as they do not form a constituent.

In (12)b, \([Prt^o + DP]\) do not make up a constituent, which accounts for why \([Prt^o + DP]\) may not undergo wh-movement, (4)b, clefting, (5)b, or coordination, (6)b. The impossibility of the modification in (7)b is caused by the impossibility of interrupting \( V^* \). The verb and the particle may undergo gapping together, (11)b, as they form a constituent. (As for why the verb may not undergo gapping on its own, (9)b, this is less clear, but maybe the verb on its own is too small to undergo gapping, and \( V^* \) is the smallest constituent that may undergo gapping.)
There are at least two problems with the verb and the particle forming a complex verb (though see McIntyre 2013 for a defence of this analysis). One is that the inflectional endings are not attached to the right edge of this complex verb, but in the middle:

(14) En. a. *He [switch-onned] the radio this morning.
   b. He [switched on] the radio this morning.

(15) En. a. *He [switch-ons] the radio every morning.
   b. He [switches on] the radio every morning.

The other is that the complex element does not have the same category (etc.) as its daughter on the right, as is the case in other compounds: dark-room is a noun like room (its daughter on the right), not an adjective like dark, whereas tax-free is an adjective like free (its daughter on the right), not a noun like tax. To switch on however is not a particle like its right hand daughter on, but a verb, just like its daughter on the left, switch. In other words, it violates Williams' (1981) "Right Hand Head Rule".

Therefore Haegeman & Guéron (1999:257-258) suggest that particle constructions actually have a basic structure parallel to the examples with prepositions, as in (16)a:

(16) a.

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{V'} & \quad \text{V°} \\
\text{switch} & \quad \text{PrtP} \\
\text{Prt'} & \quad \text{Prt°} \\
& \quad \text{DP} \\
\end{align*}
\]

\[
\text{on} \\
\end{align*}
\]

\[
\text{the radio}
\]

Consider now the consequences of the analysis in (16): (16)a is the basic structure, which will never make it to the surface, however - Prt° is unable to assign case, and therefore the DP would not be assigned a case.

There are two ways out of this problem:

- One is that the DP moves to the specifier position of PrtP, (16)b, where it may be assigned case directly from the verb, in a configuration very reminiscent of ECM (exceptional case marking). This option accounts for the possibility of the DP-Prt° order in e.g. (3)b above.
- The other is that the particle is incorporated into the verb, (16)c, in which case the verb can now assign case to the DP (maybe via the trace of the particle). This option accounts for the possibility of the DP-Prt° order in e.g. (3)a above.
The availability of both (16)b and (16)c is still compatible with the properties discussed above:

In neither (16)b nor (16)c is Prt° part of the V°, and therefore this analysis predicts e.g. switch on to attach its verbal inflection to switch rather than to switch on, (14) and (15), and it is also compatible with switch on not being a particle like on.

In neither (16)b nor (16)c is there a constituent [Prt°+DP], and this fact accounts for why [Prt°+DP] may not undergo wh-movement, (4)b, clefting, (5)b, or coordination, (6)b. The impossibility of the modification in (7)b is caused by the impossibility of interrupting V*. The verb and the particle may undergo gapping together, (11)b, as they form a constituent, V* in (13)b. (As for why the verb may not undergo gapping on its own, (9)b, the situation has not changed, maybe the verb on its own is too small to undergo gapping, and maybe V* is the smallest constituent that may undergo gapping.

English and Norwegian allow both (16)b and (16)c, whereas Swedish only allows (16)b and Danish (and Faroese) only allow (16)c (see e.g. Vikner 1987).

As also shown in Vikner (1987) and many other places, the pattern in (18)-(20) is the same with verbs embedded under causative let, e.g. Peter let the carpet vacuum-clean vs. Peter let vacuum-clean the carpet, which is why I would not like to analyse (20) as particles being head-final in Danish.

---

1 Although English (and Norwegian) allow both (16)b and (16)c, this is only true for full DPs like the radio in (3)a,b above. If the DP is a pronoun, this is not so, only (16)c is possible:

(i) En. a.* While jumping, he accidentally switched on it. = (16)b
    b. While jumping, he accidentally switched it on. = (16)c

Presumably this is part of a general cross-linguistic trend where pronouns want to be as far left as possible:

(ii) Da. a. Han læste ikke bogen. 
    b. Han læste den ikke.  
    *He read (it) not (book-the)

(iii) Ge. a. Er hat gestern das Buch gelesen. 
    b. Er hat es gestern gelesen.  
    *He has (it) yesterday (the book) read
1.3 Verbs and particles in the Germanic SOV-languages

Given the analysis of particle verbs in the SVO-languages in (16) above, the question now is to which extent this also applies to particle verbs in the SOV-languages. I would like to suggest that only those orders switch which are linked to $V^\circ$ and its complement (i.e. $V^\circ/V^*$ follows PrtP rather than precede it), whereas all other orders remain the same:

(21) Ge. Peter wird das Radio anmachen.

*Peter will the radio on-switch*

(22) a.

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{PrtP} \\
\text{Prt'} \\
\text{Prt}^\circ \\
\text{DP} \\
\text{das Radio} \\
\text{an} \\
\end{array}
\]

$\text{V'}$ $\text{V}^\circ$ machen

b.

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{DP} \\
\text{das Radio} \\
\text{V'} \\
\text{PrtP} \\
\text{Prt'} \\
\text{Prt}^\circ \\
\text{DP} \\
\text{an} \\
\end{array}
\]

$\text{V}^\circ$ machen
c.

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{PrtP} \\
\text{Prt'} \\
\text{Prt}^\circ \\
\text{DP} \\
\text{das Radio} \\
\text{an} \\
\end{array}
\]

$\text{V}^\circ$ machen

In other words, the ordering differences and similarities concerning particle incorporation between SVO-languages, (16), and SOV-languages, (22), are:

- The position of the not-completely incorporated separable particle (which at it closest is a sister of $V^\circ$ and daughter of $V^*$), to the left or right of the verb, (16) vs. (22), is a syntactic property and depends on the syntactic licensing direction of verbs in the language in question (viz. the SOV/SVO-difference).

  This is just like the position of the complement XP (object DP or PP or PrtP), left or right of the verb, which is also a syntactic property, and which varies between across the Germanic SOV-languages and the Germanic SVO-languages.
Although we shall only discuss it in detail in section 2 below, the position of the completely incorporated non-separable particle (always sister of V° and daughter of V°, Ge. verstehen vs. Da. forstå, 'understand'), left or right of the verb, is a morphological property, and thus does not co-vary with the syntactic licensing direction of verbs (i.e. no variation across the Germanic SOV/SVO-languages).

This is just like the position of the verbal inflectional morphemes, which is also a morphological property, and which also does not vary across the Germanic SOV/SVO-languages.

As was the case with (16)b,c, (22)b,c are two different ways of getting case onto the complement DP of the (separable) particle. Cf. the English and Scandinavian variation as to DP-Prt° or Prt°-DP order, (17)-(20).

The question why there is no variation in the SOV-languages comparable to (17)-(20) may now be answered: Whether an SOV-language employs only (22)b, only (22)c, or both, does not make any difference, as both (22)b,c yield the same ordering predictions (as opposed to (16)b,c, which yield different predictions).

This is because (22)c is the same as in SVO, i.e. leftwards movement, whereas (22)b is different from SVO, rightwards movement (if V° is to the right of PrtP, then quasi-incorporation of Prt° into the V* is necessarily rightwards movement). In the SOV-languages, the two movements thus have the "same" result (i.e. as far as the sequence is concerned).

I would therefore like to suggest that (16)/(22) account for the differences between English/Scandinavian on one hand and German on the other. In section 2 below, I will show that if Yiddish it assumed to be SOV, the account will also explain why Yiddish particle verbs behave so very differently from English/Scandinavian ones and so much like German ones.

(It might seem feasible to allow only (22)b, where there is no incorporation of the particle into V*, as an analysis of separable particles in the SOV-languages. However, we know from Swedish that this won't work, given that although Swedish only employs option (16)c with separable particles, they nevertheless remain separable, (19)a.)

(It might seem that if the DP would adjoin to PrtP rather than move into PrtP-spec, topicalisation of particles would receive a better analysis under (22)b, i.e. then PrtP could be topicalised. However, particle topicalisation is also possible in Swedish which only allows (16)c, which is an independent problem for the present analysis. So there is no easy analysis of particle topicalisation.)

(Another potential problem is that in some German cases, the particle might seem to be the case assigner, e.g. Sie ist dem Bankräuber nachgefahren 'She is the bank robber after-driven', i.e. she followed the bank robber by car). Here the DP has dative case, which is exactly what nach assigns when it is a preposition. Furthermore, the verb fahren, 'drive', can only have the perfect auxiliary sein, 'be', here, although it would normally have haben, 'have', when it assigns a case. See e.g. McIntyre 2007 for discussion and references.)
1.4 Passives with particles and prepositions

As the DP is assigned case from the verb in either version of the particle construction, it is not surprising that this construction may be passivised:

(23) En. a. [The radio]₁ was accidentally switched t₁ on t₁.
     b. [The radio]₁ was accidentally [switched on]₂ t₂ t₁.

It is more surprising that also the prepositional construction may be passivised ("pseudopassive"):

(24) En. Peter₁ will be laughed at t₁.

What is peculiar about the prepositional passive is that passivisation prevents not the verb *laugh* but the preposition *at* from assigning case, even though passivisation affects the morphology of the verb and not that of the preposition.

One possible analysis is to say that the reason why the passivisation of the verb *laugh* prevents the preposition *at* from assigning case is that the preposition in some sense 'forms part' of the verb:

(25) *will* *be* *laughed* *at*  

If we assume that the preposition may also be incorporated into V*, just like the particle in (16)c, we can now account for the passivisation in (24)/(25). If the preposition is incorporated into the verb in a passive construction, the DP which is left without case, may find a case in the subject position, cf. (25).

If the preposition were to be incorporated into the verb in an active construction, the DP which would be left without case, would have nowhere to find a case, and so the construction would be impossible for independent reasons.

Furthermore, a cross-linguistic prediction is made here: Only one of the languages mentioned above (namely Danish) did not allow incorporation into the V* of the particle, and so we would expect that only Danish would not allow examples like (24) which involve a parallel kind of incorporation. This prediction would seem to hold (as noted in Herslund 1984, cf. Vikner 1995:246, note 14):
(26) En. He was laughed at.

(27) No. Han ble led av.
He was laughed at (Vinje 1987:140)

(28) Sw. Skandalen skrattades åt.
Scandal-the was laughed at (Platzack 1998:122)

(29) Da. a. ?? Han blev grinet af.
b. ?? Skandalen blev grinet af.
He/Scandal-the was laughed at

(30) Da. a. Ham blev der grinet af.
b. Skandalen blev der grinet af.
Him/Scandal-the was there laughed at

(This would then further imply that in a prepositional passive with a particle, e.g. She was looked up to, this incorporation into V* takes place twice!)

In this section, section 1, the focus has been mainly on separable particles. This is where the verb particle variation is, both between different types of SVO-languages and between SVO-languages and SOV-languages, and it was suggested that what differs between SVO and SOV is the ordering inside V and inside V* (i.e. syntactic ordering, which concerns separable particles), but crucially NOT inside V° (i.e. morphological ordering, which concerns non-separable particles).

We are thus ready to have a more detailed look at both separable and non-separable verb particles, in particular with a view to the status of Yiddish as an SVO-language or an SOV-language.
2. Separable vs. non-separable particles

All the Germanic languages, including English, have both separable and non-separable verb particles:

(31) En. a. The patient underwent an operation.  
           b. The ship went under after colliding with an iceberg.

(32) En. a. The lawyer offset his travel expenses against tax.  
           b. The students set off in search of the secretary's office.

The terminology used in the literature may be confusing: Sometimes the distinction is made between separable and non-separable particles, sometimes between separable and non-separable prefixes, and sometimes between particles (which are taken to be separable) and prefixes (which are taken to be non-separable). I shall refer to separable and non-separable particles, and I shall also refer to particle verbs, by which I mean the complex verb which is formed by a verb and a particle, e.g. *undergo* in (31)a and *go under* in (31)b.

Below, I will try to show that the view that Yiddish is an OV-language like German and Dutch (as advocated also in Vikner 2001a,b, 2003, and by many others), not a VO-language like English or Danish, is supported by the facts concerning verb particles.

2.1 Different types of incorporation: V° and V*

In this subsection I set out what I take to be the basic difference between separable and non-separable particle verbs, namely that only the non-separable ones form a X°-constituent (i.e. a V°) in the syntax. Separable particle verbs do not form a V°, but a constituent of a higher projection level, which was labelled V* in (16)c/(22)c above.

As already hinted at above, I would like to suggest that separable particles are not incorporated into the verb TO THE SAME EXTENT that non-separable particles are. If we assume that a non-separable particle and its verb (*understand*) constitute a V°, then a separable particle and its verb (*send off*) do not form a V°.

This does not mean that verb and separable particle may not somehow form a constituent, it only means that they may not together constitute a V°. I take it that the closest they may get to each other is to form a syntactic constituent which is not quite as small as V°, even if it may be smaller than V', cf. that they are taken to form almost a head but not quite by e.g. Booij (1990) where they constitute a V* (which is more than V° but less than V'). For further discussion, see e.g. Haegeman & Guéron (1999:254), Zeller (2001:58-69), Haiden (2005), and also Booij (2008:9) on "pseudo-incorporation" where V* is analysed as [V V N], i.e. a VP where the object does not project any XP. See also sections 1.2 and 1.3 above on whether a given language uses the option of incorporating separable particles into V*.

I will (continue to) use the notation V*, but I will take it only to indicate a constituent which is larger than a V°, i.e. I have nothing to say about whether V* is as big as V' or not (cf. Zeller's 2001:162 formulation Vn, n>0). (33) illustrates the analyses of the verbs used in the rest of the paper.

This follows Haiden (1997:105), Wurmbrand (1998:271), and many others, in taking verb and separable particle to form a lexical unit but not necessarily also a syntactic X°-constituent.
Verb and separable particle would have this (i.e. lexical unity without syntactic unity) in common with many other combinations of a verb plus (part of) its complement, e.g. idiomatic expressions like English *to spill the beans* (i.e. 'to reveal a secret'), Danish *stille træskoene* (literally 'to put down the wooden shoes', i.e. 'to die'), German *jemandem einen Korb geben* (literally 'to give somebody a basket', i.e. 'to say no to an offer'), and Yiddish *hakn a tshaynik* (literally 'to beat a teapot', i.e. 'to talk nonsense'). Because such expressions have a noncompositional semantics, i.e. their meaning cannot be inferred from the meaning of their parts, the entire expression, e.g. *spill the beans*, has to be listed as a separate lexical entry. However, although they thus form one lexical unit, they do not form a syntactic one, as shown e.g. by Müller (2000): Syntactic operations, e.g. passivisation or V2, can affect part of such expressions while leaving other parts unaffected, so that the different parts of the lexical unit can end up rather far apart in the syntax:

(34) En. The beans were finally spilled by John.

In 1980 put-down he unfortunately wooden-shoes-the
(= 'In 1980, he unfortunately died')

(36) Ge. Warum gab sie ihm gestern einen Korb?
Why gave she him yesterday a basket?
(= 'Why did she turn him down yesterday?')

(37) Yi. Far vos haktn er shendik a tshaynik?
Why beats he constantly a teapot?
(= 'Why does he always talk nonsense?')

This is clearly parallel to those verbs with separable particles that do not have a compositional semantics, e.g. German *aufhören*, Yiddish *oyfhern*, and Danish *høre op*, literally 'to up-hear' i.e. 'to stop'. The meaning of the particle verb cannot be computed from the meaning of its constituent parts, i.e. *hear* and *up*. Although *hear* and *up* have to be listed independently in the lexicon, the lexicon therefore also has to contain separate entries for *aufhören*, *oyfhern*, and *høre op*.

(Gold 1998:192-194 in fact argues that it follows from *oyfhern* forming a lexical unit that it must form a syntactic X°-constituent. I disagree with this conclusion, because of the data from idiomatic expressions cited above).
Ackema & Neeleman (2004:71) suggest for particle verbs that the separable particle (syntactic compounding) is the unmarked option, and that the non-separable particles (morphological compounding) are the ones that have to be marked in the lexicon.

2.2 Lexical differences between German, Yiddish, and Danish

Across the three languages almost all possible combinatorial possibilities exist, i.e. not only are there particle verbs which are separable in all three languages, (38), and others which are non-separable in all three languages, (45), but there are also particle verbs which are separable in one language and non-separable in the other two or vice versa, (39), (42)-(44). Only two combinations are not found, (40) and (41): There would seem to be no particle verbs which are separable in German and non-separable in Yiddish. The particle verbs which are non-separable in German and separable in Yiddish, (42) and (43), involve only five prepositions/particles (durch/durkh 'through', hinter 'behind', über/überiber 'above', um/umorum 'around', and unter 'below', see e.g. Olsen 1997:11 ff., Zifonun et al. 1997:2088 on their special properties).

The following table only includes one example of each particle in each of the groups, and it only contains particle verbs which are clearly semantically parallel across the three languages. "+" means separable particle/prefix, "-" means non-separable particle/prefix:²

² Some, but not all, of the Danish particle verbs that I have classified here as separable also occur as non-separable particle verbs in very formal or technical usage but not in colloquial Danish (see e.g. Allan et al. 1995:327-329).

This tendency can also be observed in different examples where both the separable and non-separable variants are well-established forms. Consider German auslaufen, Yiddish oysloyfn 'run out, leak, expire'. In Danish this is separable in a more concrete sense, but non-separable in a more figurative or technical sense:

(i) Da. a. Vandet løb ud på gulvet.
   b. *Vandet udløb på gulvet.
   Water-the (out)ran (out) on floor-the

   Contract-the (out)ran (out) in 2001
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>German: +</th>
<th>Yiddish: +</th>
<th>Danish: +</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. burn down</td>
<td>b. send off</td>
<td>c. grow up</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. buy, shop</td>
<td>f. come in, enter</td>
<td>g. go out</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i. look around</td>
<td>j. nail shut</td>
<td>k. retract</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>German: +</th>
<th>Yiddish: +</th>
<th>Danish: -</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. deviate</td>
<td>b. arrive</td>
<td>c. look up (a person)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. carry out</td>
<td>f. object</td>
<td>g. reverse (e.g. a decision)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>German: -</th>
<th>Yiddish: +</th>
<th>Danish: +</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>skip, pass over</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>German: -</th>
<th>Yiddish: +</th>
<th>Danish: -</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. make holes in</td>
<td>b. surround, encircle</td>
<td>c. persuade</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>German: -</th>
<th>Yiddish: -</th>
<th>Danish: +</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. smash to pieces</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>German: -</th>
<th>Yiddish: -</th>
<th>Danish: -</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>notice</td>
<td>apologise</td>
<td>recognise</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2.3 Can the particle be left behind when the verb moves?

Moving the verb away from its particle in order to explore constituency relations (including whether the particle is separable) requires that main verbs are able to move in the language in question. As main verbs do not move in English, we shall consider only German, Yiddish and Danish.

Although there is a fair amount of lexical variation across these three languages, there are clear syntactic generalisations to be made about how separable and non-separable particles behave. The examples below use the particle verbs send off, which is separable in all three languages, and understand, which is non-separable in all three languages. Furthermore, what is said below about either type in any of the three languages (e.g. Danish separable particle verbs), holds for all verbs of that type in that language, irrespective of whether their lexical counterparts in the other two languages are separable or not.

In all three languages, it holds that if a verb particle is preverbal (non-separate) in V2 contexts, ((46), where the particle verb is the finite verb in a main clause), then it is also preverbal (non-separate) in non-V2 contexts, ((47)/(48), where the particle verb is an infinitive or past participle):

\[(46)\]
\begin{align*}
a. &\text{ Ge. } *\text{ Den Brief steht er nicht } \text{ ver.} \\
b. &\text{ Yi. } *\text{ Dem briv shteyt er nisht } \text{ far.} \\
c. &\text{ Da. } *\text{ Brevet står han ikke } \text{ for.} \\
d. &\text{ Ge. } \text{ Den Brief versteht er nicht.} \\
e. &\text{ Yi. } \text{ Dem briv farshteyt er nisht.} \\
f. &\text{ Da. } \text{ Brevet forståer han ikke.}
\end{align*}

*The letter (under)stands he not (under)*

\[(47)\]
\begin{align*}
a. &\text{ Ge. } *\text{ Den Brief wird er nicht stehen } \text{ ver.} \\
b. &\text{ Yi. } *\text{ Dem briv vet er nisht shteyn } \text{ far.} \\
c. &\text{ Da. } *\text{ Brevet vil han ikke stå } \text{ for.} \\
d. &\text{ Ge. } \text{ Den Brief wird er nicht verstehen.} \\
e. &\text{ Yi. } \text{ Dem briv vet er nisht farshteyn.} \\
f. &\text{ Da. } \text{ Brevet vil han ikke forstå.}
\end{align*}

*The letter will he not (under)stand (under)*

\[(48)\]
\begin{align*}
a. &\text{ Ge. } *\text{ Den Brief hat er nicht (ge)standen } \text{ ver.} \\
b. &\text{ Yi. } *\text{ Dem briv hot er nisht (ge)shtanen } \text{ far.} \\
c. &\text{ Da. } *\text{ Brevet har han ikke stået } \text{ for.} \\
d. &\text{ Ge. } \text{ Den Brief hat er nicht verstanden.} \\
e. &\text{ Yi. } \text{ Dem briv hot er nisht farshtanen.} \\
f. &\text{ Da. } \text{ Brevet har han ikke forstået.}
\end{align*}

*The letter has he not (under)stood (under)*

So far, I have painted the following partial pictures:

\[(49)\]
\begin{align*}
\begin{array}{c|c|c|c}
\text{V2} & \text{non-V2} & \text{V2} & \text{non-V2} \\
\hline
\text{preverbal/ (46) } & \text{ non-separ.} & \text{preverbal/ (46) } & \text{ non-separ.} \\
\text{(47)/(48) preverbal/} & \text{ non-sepa.} & \text{(47)/(48) preverbal/} & \text{ non-sepa.}
\end{array}
\end{align*}
Consider now postverbal (separate) particles. If a Danish particle is postverbal (separate) in V2 contexts, (50)c, then it is also postverbal (separate) in non-V2 contexts, (51)c & (52)c. However, even when a German or Yiddish particle is postverbal (separate) in V2 contexts, (50)a,b, it is still preverbal (non-separate) in non-V2 contexts, (51)d,e & (52)d,e:

(50) a. Ge. Den Brief schickt er ab.
   b. Yi. Dem briv shikt er avek.
   d. Ge. * Den Brief abshickt er.
   e. Yi. * Dem briv avekshikt er.

(51) a. Ge. * Den Brief wird er schicken ab.
   b. Yi. ?? Dem briv vet er shiken avek.
   d. Ge. Den Brief wird er abschicken.
   e. Yi. Dem briv vet er avekshiken.

(52) a. Ge. * Den Brief hat er geschickt ab.
   b. Yi. ?? Dem briv hot er geshikt avek.
   d. Ge. Den Brief hat er abgeschickt.
   e. Yi. Dem briv hot er avekgeschikt.

In other words, Yiddish and German particles that have to be postverbal (separate) under V2 still have to be preverbal in non-V2 contexts, whereas Danish particles that have to be "stranded" under V2 may never be preverbal in non-V2 contexts.

The full picture for German and Yiddish is thus that both those particles that are preverbal (non-separate) under V2, (46)-(48), and those particles that are postverbal (separate) under V2, (50)-(52), are preverbal in non-V2 contexts. There simply are no German and Yiddish particles which are postverbal in non-V2 contexts.

The full picture for Danish is that whereas those particles that are preverbal (nonseparate) under V2, (46)-(48), are also preverbal in non-V2 contexts, those particles that are postverbal (separate) under V2, (50)-(52), are also postverbal in non-V2 contexts.

(53) a. Danish

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>V2</th>
<th>non-V2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>preverbal/ (46)</td>
<td>(47)/(48)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>preverbal/ non-separ.</td>
<td>non-separ.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>postverbal/ (50)</td>
<td>(51)/(52)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>postverbal/ separate</td>
<td>separate</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

b. German & Yiddish

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>V2</th>
<th>non-V2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>preverbal/ (46)</td>
<td>(47)/(48)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>preverbal/ non-separ.</td>
<td>non-separ.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>postverbal/ (50)</td>
<td>(51)/(52)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>postverbal/ separate</td>
<td>separate</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In German and Yiddish (and the other Germanic OV-languages), all particles, even those that are postverbal under verb movement (i.e. particles that are left behind when the verb undergoes V2), have to be preverbal in non-V2 contexts, as opposed to Danish (and the other Germanic VO-languages), where verb particles that are postverbal under verb movement (i.e. particles that are left behind under V2) are always postverbal (always separated from their verbs).

### 2.4 Can the particle move independently of the verb?

The previous section examined whether verbs could move with or without their particles. This section will do the exact opposite, i.e. examine whether particles may move with or without their verbs.

Wurmbrand (1998:276) argues (for German) that facts concerning topicalisation of particles also show a difference in degree of incorporation, in that **only separable particles may undergo movement in the syntax, non-separable particles (prefixes) always form a X°-constituent together with the verb.**

Particles can be topicalised, but only if they are contrastively focused (Heidolph et al. 1981:720, Diesing 1997:384, Wurmbrand 1998:274, Zeller 2001:88-99, against Stiebels & Wunderlich 1994:923). This requires not only that the particles are separable but also that they are semantically transparent, (82), as opposed to the semantically opaque ones in (84):

\[(54)\]

| a. Ge. | Er ist hereingekommen. |
| b. Yi. | Er iz arayngekumen. |
|        | He is in-come          |

\[(55)\]

| a. Ge. | Herein ist er gekomen. |
| b. Yi. | Arayn iz er gekumen. |
|        | In is he come (= 'In he came') |

\[(56)\]

| a. Ge. | Sie hat ihn hereingelegt. |
|        | She has him in-laid (hereinlegen 'deceive', 'betray') |
| b. Yi. | Si hot im arayngezogt. |
|        | She has him in-said (araynzogn 'tell off', 'scold') |

\[(57)\]

|        | In has she him laid |
| b. Yi. | *Arayn hot si im gezogt. |
|        | In has she him said |

The important difference is that non-separable particles, even semantically transparent ones, can never be topicalised:

\[(58)\]

| Ge. a. | Er soll den Lastwagen entladen, nicht beladen. |
|        | He shall the lorry PRT-load, not PRT-load |
|        | (= 'He shall unload the lorry, not load it'; entladen 'unload', beladen 'load') |
b. * Ent- soll er den Lastwagen laden, nicht beladen.  
   NON-SEPARABLE, TRANSPARENT
   \*PRT shall he the lorry load, not \*PRT(-load)

(59) Yi. a.  
   Di UNO zol zey antvofenen, nisht bavofenen.  
   The UN shall them disarm, not PRT-arm  
   (= 'The UN shall disarm them, not arm them';  
   antvofenen 'disarm', bevofenen 'give weapons to')

b. * Ant- zol di UNO zey vofenen, nisht bavofenen.  
   NON-SEPARABLE, TRANSPARENT

(60) Ge. a.  
   Er soll die Tür aufmachen, nicht zumachen  
   He shall the door up-make, not to-make  
   (= 'He shall open the door, not close it'; aufmachen 'open', zumachen 'close')

b. Auf soll er die Tür machen, nicht zumachen.  
   SEPARABLE, TRANSPARENT

c. Auf soll er die Tür machen, nicht zu.  
   SEPARABLE, TRANSPARENT
   \*Up shall he the door make, not to(-make)  
   ((b) based on Wurmbrand 1998:272)

(61) Yi. a.  
   Er zol arayngeyn, nit aroysgeyn  
   He shall in-go, not out-go  
   (= 'He shall go in, not go out'; arayngeyn 'go in', aroysgeyn 'go out')

b. Arayn zol er geyn, nit aroysgeyn.  
   SEPARABLE, TRANSPARENT

c. Arayn zol er geyn, nit aroys.  
   SEPARABLE, TRANSPARENT
   \*In shall he go, not out (go)

The data are parallel in English and Danish:

(62) En. a.  
   Down came the barrier.  
   SEPARABLE, TRANSPARENT

b. * Down broke the computer.  
   SEPARABLE, NON-TRANSPARENT

c. * Down she graded her assessment.  
   NON-SEPARABLE, TRANSPARENT

d. * Down he sized his company.  
   NON-SEPARABLE, NON-TRANSPARENT

(63) Da. a.  
   Ned gik bommen.  
   Down went barrier-the  
   SEPARABLE, TRANSPARENT

   SEPARABLE, NON-TRANSPARENT
   Down froze he rest-the of food-the

c. * Ned vil alle ruste, ikke op  
   NON-SEPARABLE, TRANSPARENT
   Down/dis- will everyone arm, not up

d. * Ned ville hun ikke gøre ham.  
   NON-SEPARABLE, NON-TRANSPARENT
   Down would she not do him

I would like to suggest that the fact that even semantically transparent non-separable particles cannot  
be topicalised may be accounted for by appealing to the ban on traces inside X°-constituents (Baker  
1988:73), i.e. in some sense, syntax cannot reach inside X°, maybe because is is also a unit on the  
morphological level (even in those cases where it was built by syntax). Topicalisation of either kind of
particle leaves a trace, but only in the case of non-separable particles would this trace be situated inside a V°.

(This might avoid an appeal to excorporation as an explanation for e.g. (50)a,b below, i.e. V2 leaving a particle behind, which was suggested e.g. in Roberts (1991:215), and criticised in Schwartz & Vikner (1996:49), because excorporation leaves us without an explanation e.g. why clitics then have to come along when their verbs move in the Romance languages or for why there could exist a class of non-separable particles that have to come along when their verbs move in the Germanic languages. See Roberts 2010:206-208 for a different analysis.)

Wurmbrand (1998:276) observes that these data also show that separable particles may behave as phrases, which also makes it unlikely that they may incorporate into a V°. The data discussed in this section are thus better accounted for if only non-separable particles (and thus not separable particles) form a V° together with their verb than if all particles form a V° together with their verb. However, the data discussed also show that it may not always be possible to move the particle away from the verb in order to test whether the particle is separable or not.

2.5 Diesing (1997): Separable particles are incorporated into V°

According to Diesing (1997:385-386), neither the fact that Yiddish separable particles are preverbal in (51)e/(52)e, nor the fact that Yiddish separable particles may be topicalised, (55)b/(61)b,c necessarily show that Yiddish is an OV-language. The preverbal position of the particle avek in (51)e/(52)e is a result of the particle (avek) having been incorporated into the V° (avekshikn/avekgeshikt), says Diesing.

According to Diesing, this is supported by three facts, which will be discussed in turn. I shall argue that the data do not show that all cases of preverbal particles plus their verb form a V°. If this is correct, then the fact that outside V2-contexts all separable particles occur preverbally, not postverbally, still needs an explanation. Not surprisingly, I would like to suggest that the reason is that Yiddish is an OV-language.

2.5.1 Modification of particles

The first of Diesing's facts is that separable particles can be modified in postverbal position, but not in preverbal position (araynkumen 'come in' behaves syntactically exactly like avekshikn 'send off' in (50)-(52), cf. that both belong to group (38) above):

(64) Yi. a. Er iz gekumen glaykh arayn.
    b. * Er iz glayk arayngekumen.
    He is (right in-)come (right in) (= 'He came right in')
    (from Diesing 1997:385, (27a), (28a)
I have not been able to reproduce this data, my informant, Marvin Herzog (editor-in-chief of *The Language and Culture Atlas of Ashkenazic Jewry*, Niemeyer, Tübingen), had exactly the opposite judgments of (64), i.e. he found (64)b better than (64)a. The example may be problematic anyway, as it is not clear that glaykh modifies only the particle, because it may modify the entire VP (in addition to 'directly', glaykh may also mean 'immediately' or 'right away'). In the following example, which is inspired by an example from Wurmbrand (1998:273) given below as (66)a, *in gantsn* (literally 'in the whole', i.e. 'completely, altogether') modifies only *um* ('over'), as is clear from the interpretation:

(65) Yi. a. *Zi h**o**t im nit in gantsn umgeshtoysn.  
She has him not (completely over-)knocked (completely over-)
 (= 'She did not knock him over completely, i.e. he is still standing')

This is parallel to the situation in German, where a particle may also be modified when it is placed to the left of the verb:

(66) Ge. a. Hans hat das Verkehrsschild halb umgefahren.  
*Hans hat the traffic sign half around-driven*  
(= 'Hans almost knocked down the traffic sign ')

b. Hans hat die Tür weit aufgemacht.  
*Hans hat the door wide up-made*  
(= 'Hans threw the door wide open')

I therefore disagree with this first set of data of Diesing's, in that I think that it is possible to modify a preverbal separable particle. This would be unexpected if particles could only be preverbal if they were incorporated.

### 2.5.2 Particle verbs and stress

Diesing's second fact is that the combination preverbal separable particle and verb only receive one main stress (see also Wiese 1996:94 and Wurmbrand 1998:284), whereas the combination verb and postverbal particle receive two main stresses, just like two independent elements do:

(67) Yi. a. Ikh bin aRAYNgekumen.  
PREVERBAL PARTICLE: ONE MAIN STRESS

b. Ikh bin geKUMen aRAYN.  
POSTVERBAL PARTICLE: TWO MAIN STRESSES

\[ I \text{ am (in-)come in} \]  
(= 'I came in')

c. Ikh bin NEKHtn geKUMen.  
TWO ELEMENTS: TWO MAIN STRESSES

\[ I \text{ am yesterday come} \]  
(= 'I arrived yesterday')  
(from Diesing 1997:385-386, (29))

Whereas two stresses may indeed be a reliable indication that incorporation has not taken place, I am not convinced that the inverse is the case, i.e. I doubt that a single main stress is possible only if incorporation has taken place. The embedded clauses in (68)/(69) have the same stress conditions: In all four of them, there is only one main stress (indicated by capitals), and yet it is highly unlikely that (68)b/(69)b have incorporation, because it would be incorporation of a PP into a V°.
2.5.3 Further morphological processes

The third fact that Diesing (1997:386) cites is also cited by Gold (1998:194) in support of preverbal (separable) particles being incorporated into the verb, even if Gold (1998:192) actually assumes also separable particles to be base-generated to the left of the verb. This third fact is that further morphological derivational processes show that the particle has been incorporated:

(70) Yi. a. der araynbrekher  
the.M in-break-er  (= 'the male burglar')

b. di araynbrekherke  
the.F in-break-er-ess  (= 'the female burglar')  (Diesing 1997:386, (30b))

I agree that even particles which have to be stranded/postverbal under V2 may be incorporated during further morphological processes like nominalisations, but I do not think that this shows that such particles always have to be incorporated into their verb, i.e. also when they are not involved in any further morphological processes, e.g. in examples like (51)d,e/(52)d,e. This is supported by the following data from Danish, where particles also seem to be incorporated during further morphological processes:

(71) Da. a. halmafbrænding hay-down-burn-ing 'burning of hay' (noun)

b. opvokset up-grow-n 'grown up' (adj.)
c. udholdenhed out-last-ness 'endurance'
d. indkøbscenter in-buy-center 'shopping centre'
e. eftergivnenhed after-give-ness 'indulgence'
f. tildækning to-cover-ing 'cover' (noun)
g. tilbagetrækning back-pull-ing 'withdrawal'
h. sammenstod together-bump 'clash, collision'

The point is that the particle verbs underlying (71) are all from the group in (38) above: They never incorporate the particle into the verb, the particle always occurs postverbally, exactly like the particle afsted in (50)c,f, (51)c,f and (52)c,f:
(72) Da. a. * Børn bør opvokse i tryghed.
   b. Børn bør vokse op i tryghed.

Children should (up)grow (up) in security

(73) Da. a. * Jeg vil først indkøbe i morgen.
   b. Jeg vil først købe ind i morgen.

I will first (in)buy in tomorrow (= 'I won't go shopping until tomorrow')

(74) Da. a. * De har eftergivet for presset fra udlandet.
   b. De har givet efter for presset fra udlandet.

They have (after)given (after) for pressure-the from outland-the

(75) Da. a. * De vil tilbage trække tropperne.
   b. De vil trække tropperne tilbage.

They will (back)pull troops-the (back) (= 'They will pull the troops back')

The examples in (72)-(75) show that the particles and their verbs do not form a V°. Therefore the kind of incorporation during further morphological processes seen in (70) and (71) can not be taken to be an indication that syntactic incorporation also takes place in the particle verbs themselves.

2.5.4 Conclusion

In this section, I argued against Diesing's claim that all preverbal particles are incorporated into their verb (i.e. form a V° with their verbs), mainly by showing that the data cited by Diesing in support of her analysis are also compatible with other views.

In the following section, I will give other arguments against Diesing's analysis. Because her analysis says that all particles occurring preverbally form a V° with their verbs, it would seem to have no way of accounting for the differences between separable and non-separable particle verbs concerning e.g. the placement of the participial prefix ge- and the infinitival marker tsu.

An alternative analysis, which says that only non-separable particle verbs form a V°, is compatible with the data cited above, and it is much better suited to deal with the data discussed in the following section.
2.6 Infixation of -ge- and -tsu/-zu-

This section will consider the position of the participial prefix ge- and the infinitival marker tsu in particle verbs.

2.6.1 Past participles

Yiddish has a very strict correlation between whether or not a particle has to be left behind during V2 and whether or not ge- occurs between the particle and the verb stem in the past participle. This is just like other languages which prefix their past participle with ge-, e.g. Afrikaans (Donaldson 1993:224), Dutch (e.g. Geerts et al. 1984:427) and German.

The generalisation is that if and only if the particle has to be left behind during V2, (50)b,e, i.e. if there is no incorporation in the present analysis, the past participle must include ge between the particle and the verb stem:

(76) Yi.
   a. arayngkumen, *araynkumen, *gearaynkumen come in (38)f
   b. avekgeshkht, *avekshikt, *geavekshikt sent off (38)b
      (araynkumen and avekshikt are both possible as finite verbs, but not as past participles).

If and only if the particle has to be carried along during V2, (46)b,e, i.e. if there is incorporation even in the present analysis, the past participle may not include ge- anywhere:

(77) Yi.
   a. bamerkt, *bagemerkt, *gebamerkt noticed (45)a
   b. farshtanen, *fargeshtanen, *gefarshtanen understood (45)d

2.6.2 Infinitives

Infinitives with tsu present a parallel case to the past participles with ge-, but without the above-mentioned exception concerning -irn-verbs. In some cases the infinitives may appear with the infinitival marker tsu 'to':

(78) Yi.
   a. Er hoft ibertsulebn.
      He hopes over-to-live (= 'He hopes to survive')
      (Zaretsky 1926:120)
   b. Ikh pruv tsu farshteyn.
      I try to understand
      (Weinreich 1971:328)

The generalisation is that if and only if the particle has to be left behind during V2, (50)b,e, i.e. if there is no incorporation in the present analysis, the tsu-infinitive must include tsu between the particle and the verb stem, cf. (78)a:

(79) Yi.
   a. arayntsukumen, *tsu araynkumen come in (38)f
   b. avektshishkn, *tsu avekshkn send off (38)b
   c. optsupolirm *tsu oppolirm polish

If and only if the particle has to be carried along during V2, (46)b,e, i.e. if there is incorporation even in the present analysis, tsu must precede the entire particle verb, cf. (78)b:
(80) Yi. a.  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Verb Form</th>
<th>English Equivalent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><code>tsu bamerkn</code></td>
<td>notice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><code>*batsumerkn</code></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

b.  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Verb Form</th>
<th>English Equivalent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><code>tsu farshteyn</code></td>
<td>understand</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><code>*fartsushteyn</code></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This too is a feature which Yiddish shares with the (other) Germanic OV-languages.

2.6.3 Conclusion

Summing up this section on participial and infinitival forms: Only if the preverbal particles that are left behind under V2 are taken never to be incorporated into a V°, is it possible to explain the difference concerning the occurrence of `-ge-` and `-tsu-` between the particle and the verb stem.

I would like to suggest that `-ge-` and `-tsu-` can only be "prefixed" on constituents with the category V° (this is why they cannot precede separable particles, (76) and (79)).

I would also like to suggest that `-tsu-` prefers to be "prefixed" on the largest V°-constituent possible (this is why it prefers to precede non-separable prefixes, (80), rather than separate them from their verbs. As for why I take this only to be a preference, see Vikner (2005:99).

Then it would follow that in separable particle verbs like `araynkumen` and `avekshikn`, (76), the particle is never incorporated even when it is preverbal: If incorporation was obligatory or optionally possible, it should be possible to have `-ge-` and `-tsu-` prefixed to the entire particle verb in (76) and (79).
3. General conclusion

In section 1, it was suggested that prepositions and (separable) particles have the same structure:

\[
(81) \quad \begin{array}{c}
\text{a.} \\
\text{b.}
\end{array}
\]

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{Spec} \\
P^* \\
PP \\
P' \\
\text{DP}
\end{array}
\quad \begin{array}{c}
\text{Spec} \\
P^* \\
PrtP \\
Prt'
\end{array}
\quad \begin{array}{c}
\text{Spec} \\
P^* \\
\text{DP}
\end{array}
\]

the difference being that prepositions assign case, whereas particles do not. Therefore the complement DP (e.g. the book in throw out the book) will not be assigned a case. This problem has two potential solutions:

- **EITHER** the particle is incorporated into the verb (i.e. into V*), in which case V* (maybe via the trace in Prt°) may now assign case to the "object",
- **OR** the DP may move to PrtP-spec, where it can be assigned case directly by V° (as in ECM-constructions).

Both of these two constructions are straightforwardly passivisable.

The SVO-languages vary as to which strategy they allow, leading to variation in particle constructions across the SVO-languages (and similar variation in prespositional passives).

The same strategies were then shown to have non-distinct results for the SOV-languages, explaining why the SOV-languages do not have any variation in particle constructions similar to the one found among the SVO-languages.

Section 2 then extended the discussion to the difference between separable and non-separable particles, and I argued that even when separable particles incorporate, they do not incorporate to the same extent as non-separable particles, in that only the latter incorporate into V°.

- The position of the not-completely incorporated **SEPARABLE** particle (which at it closest is a sister of V° and daughter of V*), to the left or right of the verb, is a **SYNTACTIC** property and depends on the syntactic licensing direction of verbs in the language in question (viz. the SOV/SVO-difference). This is just like the position of the complement XP (object DP or PP or PrtP), left or right of the verb, which is also a syntactic property, and which varies between across the Germanic SOV-languages and the Germanic SVO-languages.

- The position of the completely incorporated **NON-SEPARABLE** particle (sister of V° and daughter of V°), left or right of the verb, is a **MORPHOLOGICAL** property, and thus does not co-vary with the syntactic licensing direction of verbs (i.e. no variation across the Germanic SOV/SVO-languages). This is just like the position of the verbal inflectional morphemes, which is also a morphological property, and which also does not vary across the Germanic SOV/SVO-languages.

These properties were discussed and tested with reference to

- whether the particle could be left behind when its verb moves (only possible with separable particles), and
- whether the particle could move independently of its verb (only possible with separable particles with transparent semantics).
The results were also discussed with special reference to particles in Yiddish, comparing them to Danish and German, with the following conclusion, contra Diesing’s (1997) and Gold's (1998) analyses:

- **If and only if** Yiddish is an OV-language like German and Dutch, *not* a VO-language like English or Danish, can it be explained why Yiddish is like German and unlike Scandinavian in allowing even those particles to occur preverbally in non-V2 constructions that do *not* incorporate, as seen
  - by their not moving along with the finite verb during V2 (section 2.3),
  - by their ability to topicalise (section 2.4), and
  - by their requiring participial/infinitival forms with intervening -ge-/ -tsu- (section 2.6).
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