

When Particles Won't Part

1 Particles (*out, up*) come in two types, thematic particles (θ -Prt) and aspectual particles (Asp-Prt). The former are θ -role assigners, base-generated as syntactically autonomous heads forming a constituent with their thematic dependent. That constituent is either the 'bare' projection of the particle (cf. (1a)) or a full-fledged small clause including the functional structure that small clauses generally involve (here abbreviated as 'XP'; cf. (1b)). The small clause functional head X in (1b) has an EPP property which (cf. Svenonius 1996) can be satisfied either (i) via raising of DP into SpecXP (cf. (2a)), which results in the order V–DP–Prt, or (ii) via raising of Prt up to X (cf. (2b)), which delivers the order V–Prt–DP.

2 Due to the absence of XP, in (1a) it is impossible for the particle to be licensed within the verb's complement. UG deals with the licensing problem by *incorporating* the head of the 'bare' lexical complement of the verb (cf. (3)). Incorporation, not being triggerable as movement (since lexical heads are not probes), involves the creation of the structure of the complex verb in (3) *in the lexicon*, and associates the non-heads of these complex verbs with copies in V's complement.

3 Aspectual particles (Asp-Prt) are different from θ -Prts in not assigning a θ -role to a VP-internal constituent and instead making an aspectual contribution to the VP as a whole. Aspect is in the inflectional domain of the clause, c-commanding and scoping over VP; aspectual morphology is inflectional morphology. From the point of view of the checking approach to inflectional morphology espoused in the minimalist program (Chomsky 1995), this leads to the base-generation of aspectual particles on the complex V, checking features in a VP-external aspectual head Asp that has scope over the VP, as in (4). The fact that, in West-Germanic, aspectual particles are inseparable from the verb follows straightforwardly.

4 Aspectual particles can be combined with otherwise separable θ -Prts, *but only if the θ -Prt incorporates* and thus becomes inseparable from the verb. This directly refutes Keyser & Roeper's (1992) account of the ungrammaticality of English **re-V Prt* (cf. **John reheated the food up*), predicated on the premise that there is a single 'abstract clitic' position on V which *re-* and the θ -Prt compete for. Instead, we block combinations of Asp-Prts and unincorporated θ -Prts by ruling out the structures in (5), with (5a) crashing because Asp can only be specified for a *unique* bundle of aspectual features and (5b) leading to a violation of Full Interpretation due to failure of checking of either one of the particles' formal features. By contrast, (6), with the θ -Prt incorporated into the verb, converges: with the two particles teaming up in an adjunction structure (as decreed by the LCA; Kayne 1994), the <FF>s of the two particles *coalesce* into a composite feature bundle <FF3> (cf. Selkirk's 1982 Percolation Convention) including the formal features of the two particles, checkable against a matching <FF3> in Asp⁰.

5 The generalization that Asp-Prt and θ -Prt may combine only if θ -Prt incorporates holds for all Germanic languages (albeit trivially in English, which forbids Prt-incorporation altogether). But there is variation within Germanic when it comes to the ability of [[Asp-Prt θ -Prt] V] complexes to undergo *Verb Second* (V2) — such is fine throughout Scandinavian but impossible in most cases in Dutch and German. We say 'in most cases' because not all [[Asp-Prt θ -Prt] V] complexes resist V2 in West-Germanic. For Dutch (the language of principal investigation in this paper), we distinguish four major types, with Type III further subdivided into three subcases, as in table (7). The middle column of this table finds a perfect match in that of table (8), tabulating the placement of the infinitival marker *te vis-à-vis* the particles. This parallel leads to the descriptive generalization in (9), which captures both West-Germanic and Scandinavian: the Scandinavian infinitival marker is systematically outside (i.e., to the left of) material incorporated into V; concomitantly, such material will always be carried along with the verb under V2, as desired.

6 We derive the descriptive generalization in (9) with the aid of the hypothesis (cf. Bech 1955, Haider 2002) that the infinitival marker *te/zu* of Dutch and German is an inflectional affix, base-generated inside the complex verb (not the lexicalisation of a VP-external functional head). Thus, the placement of the infinitival marker *vis-à-vis* non-inflectional incorporated material gives the language user an explicit clue with respect to the location of the inflection inside the complex verb. This clue can then be exploited in

